

35

SPEECH

OF

MR. SILAS WRIGHT, OF NEW-YORK,

ON

THE PROPOSITION TO AMEND THE TARIFF;

DELIVERED

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OF

THE UNITED STATES,

MARCH 7, 1828.

WASHINGTON:

PRINTED BY GREEN & JARVIS.

1828.

337.3
W9365

BY APPOINTMENT
TO THE
LIBRARY OF THE
CONGRESS

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, and the bill reported by the Committee on Manufactures, entitled "An act in amendment of the several acts imposing duties on imports," being under consideration, a proposition was made by the Chairman of that Committee, (Mr. Mallary,) to strike out, in section second, the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth paragraphs, which read as follows:

First. On wool unmanufactured, seven cents per pound, and also, in addition thereto, forty per cent. ad valorem, until the thirtieth day of June; one thousand eight hundred and twenty-nine; from which time, an additional ad valorem duty of five per cent. shall be imposed, annually, until the whole of said ad valorem duty shall amount to fifty per cent. And all wool imported on the skin shall be estimated as to weight and value, and shall pay the same rate of duty as other imported wool.

Second. On manufactures of wool, or of which wool shall be a component part, (except blankets, worsted stuff goods, bombazines, hosiery, mits, gloves, caps, and bindings,) the actual value of which, at the place whence imported, shall not exceed fifty cents the square yard, there shall be levied, collected, and paid, sixteen cents on every square yard.

Third. On all manufactures of wool, or of which wool shall be a component part, except as aforesaid, the actual value of which, at the place whence imported, shall exceed fifty cents the square yard, and shall not exceed one dollar the square yard, there shall be levied, collected, and paid, a duty of forty cents on every square yard.

Fourth. On all manufactures of wool, or of which wool shall be a component part, except as aforesaid, the actual value of which, at the place whence imported, shall exceed one dollar the square yard, and shall not exceed two dollars and fifty cents the square yard, there shall be levied, collected, and paid, a duty of one dollar on every square yard.

Fifth. All manufactures of wool, or of which wool shall be a component part, except as aforesaid, the actual value of which, at the place whence imported, shall exceed two dollars and fifty cents the square yard, and shall not exceed four dollars the square yard, shall be deemed to have cost, at the place whence imported, four dollars the square yard, and a duty of forty per cent. ad valorem shall be levied, collected, and paid, on such valuation.

Sixth. On all manufactures of wool, or of which wool shall be a component part, except as aforesaid, the actual value of which, at the place whence imported, shall exceed four dollars the square yard, there shall be levied, collected, and paid, a duty of forty-five per cent. ad valorem.

And to insert in lieu thereof the following:

First. On all wool unmanufactured, the actual value of which, at the place whence imported, shall exceed eight cents per pound, twenty cents per pound, until the thirtieth day of June, one thousand eight hundred and twenty-nine, after which time a further duty of two and one-half cents per pound, per annum, in addition, until the whole duty amounts to fifty cents.

Second. All manufactures of wool, or of which wool shall be a component part, (except blankets, worsted stuff goods, bombazines, hosiery, mits, gloves, caps, and bindings,) the actual value of which, at the place whence imported, shall not exceed fifty cents the square yard, shall be deemed to have cost fifty cents the square yard, and charged with a duty of forty per cent. on such valuation, until the thirtieth day of June, one thousand eight hundred and twenty-nine, after which a duty of five per cent. per annum, in addition, until the whole amount of duty shall be fifty per cent.

Third. All manufactures of wool, or of which wool shall be a component part, except as aforesaid, the actual value of which, at the place whence imported, shall exceed fifty cents the square yard, and shall not exceed two dollars and fifty cents the square yard, shall be deemed to have cost two dollars and fifty cents the square yard, and charged with the amount of duty, and in the manner before in this section provided.

Fourth. All manufactures of wool, or of which wool shall be a component part, except as aforesaid, the actual value of which, at the place whence imported, shall exceed two dollars and fifty cents the square yard, and shall not exceed four dollars the square yard, shall be deemed to have cost four dollars the square yard, and charged with the amount of duty, and in the manner before provided in this section.

Fifth. All manufactures of wool, or of which wool shall be a component part, except as aforesaid, the actual value of which, at the place whence imported, shall exceed four dollars the square yard, and shall not exceed six dollars the square yard, shall be deemed to have cost six dollars the square yard, and shall be charged with the amount of duty, and in the manner as is before provided in this section.

Sixth. All manufactures of wool, or of which wool shall be a component part, except as aforesaid, the actual value of which, at the place whence imported, shall exceed six dollars the square yard, shall be charged with the amount of duty, and in the manner before provided in this section.

SPEECH.

MR. WRIGHT, of New-York, addressed the Committee as follows:

Mr. Chairman: I was a member of the Committee which reported this bill to the House. I was one of the majority of that Committee who agreed to the bill in its present shape; and candor compels me to admit the truth of the statement made by the honorable Chairman of the Committee on Manufactures, that I was made the organ of the majority of the Committee in drafting the imperfect report which accompanied this bill. Therefore, Sir, I am justly chargeable, to a great extent, with the errors, if errors there are, in that report. This, in addition to my public duty as a member of this House, compels me to trouble the Committee with the reasons which brought me, and which I believe brought a majority of the Committee on Manufactures, to agree to the bill now upon your table. I am not, however, prepared to debate this bill otherwise than in detail, and upon its several provisions; and therefore I have withheld my remarks until the amendment proposed by the honorable Chairman should become the question before the Committee. That I now understand to be the question, and to that it shall be my object to direct my remarks. Yet, Sir, I fear if I should promise to be concise, I should not be able to perform that promise. It will be impossible for me to present my views within as short a time as I could wish; and I shall be compelled to make some references to the testimony taken before the Committee on Manufactures, and to go into statistical calculations, which will be dry and uninteresting to the Committee, and, I fear, scarcely intelligible to those who may have the patience to listen. I will endeavor, however, to make them as clear and plain as I am able, and to give the grounds upon which they are made, so that their accuracy may be tested.

And here, Sir, it is my duty to premise that it has been my object, and I believe it to have been the object of the majority of the Committee, to frame a bill which should have in view the protection of the leading interests of the country. I have supposed that in all laws having a reference to the protection of the domestic industry of this country, agriculture should be considered the prominent and leading interest. This I have considered the basis upon which the other great interests rest, and to which they are to be considered as subservient. Still this is not to be considered as entitled to protection, exclusive of the manufacturing interest. I do not believe that a law which would be injurious to manufactures would be beneficial to agriculture; but I do believe that protection to manufactures should be given with express reference to the effect upon agriculture, and that no protection can be wise, or consistent with the policy of this government, which has not for its object, to add strength and vigor to this great and vital interest.

of the country. The same may be said of the commercial interest, as it also is only subservient to the great interests of agriculture.

But, Sir, it will be found difficult, if not impossible, to draw a bill, intended to furnish general protection to the domestic industry of this country, which will not, in some of its provisions, operate injuriously upon some one of the interests concerned, and in some sections of the country. One leading principle, however, which operated upon my mind in the formation of the present bill, is, that it is not, and cannot be the policy of this government, or of this Congress, to turn the manufacturing capital of this country to the manufacture of a raw material of a foreign country, while we do or can produce the same material in sufficient quantities ourselves.

This I consider to be a rule of universal application, and to extend itself, not only to the same raw material, but to any which shall be equally valuable, and may be substituted for the raw material imported; and I cannot suppose that, in legislating for the protection of the industry of the country, this rule should ever be lost sight of. If the time should arrive when there should be a surplus of labor in this country, and when the cultivation of our soil, and the manufacture of its productions, should not require the employment of all the labor of the country, then a different rule might be applicable: then it might be sound policy to encourage the importation of foreign materials, that their manufacture might employ any surplus of domestic labor. This principle it is my intention to apply to the subject of wool and woolsens now before the Committee. I am aware that the question involved in that part of the bill now under consideration, and the proposed amendment, is one of the most interesting and important embraced in the whole bill. It occupies much of the feeling, both of the manufacturer of wool and the wool grower. It touches the interest of both, and it would be very difficult even for experience to say what would be relatively just between the two interests. But, Sir, if constant reference is had to the facts which appear in the testimony taken before the Committee on Manufactures, and to the statistical information which they have been able to collect, something like an approach to certainty may be attained. This examination has been taken with this view, and it is or is not to answer any valuable purpose, as this bill shall or shall not be discussed with reference to the facts it discloses. With that reference it shall be my business to discuss the proposed amendment, and my observations shall be, as far as possible, directed to this testimony, as the foundation of the positions which I shall attempt to establish.

The first proposition in the order of the bill and amendment, is the proposed duty upon wool. This, by the bill reported by the Committee, is fixed at a specific duty of seven cents upon every pound of wool, and an increase of the ad valorem duty, now imposed by law, of 30 per cent. to 40 per cent. with an extension of that ad valorem duty to all kinds of wool.

The amendment proposes that all wool, costing in a foreign country 8 cents per pound, or under, shall pay the present duty of 15 per

cent. ad valorem only, and imposes a specific duty of 20 cents per pound upon all wool costing more than 8 cents per pound in a foreign country, without reference to its value. It will be readily seen that the proposed duty of 15 per cent. ad valorem upon the coarse wools costing eight cents per pound, and under, is merely nominal, and cannot answer to check the importation of those qualities of wool. One of the reasons assigned by the Hon. Chairman of the Committee on Manufactures for proposing to encourage the importation of these qualities of wool under a nominal duty, is, that the same qualities of wool are not produced in this country; that the manufacturers are bound to import them; and that if they are excluded, their place cannot be supplied by our own wools. To these positions I cannot yield my assent. I do not believe the fact to be so. I believe the United States now produce sufficient quantities of coarse wool for every demand of the present manufactories. But suppose this is not the case; suppose the qualities of coarse wools imported are not, and will not be produced in this country: What then? Is it sound policy to import them free of duty? I must first answer another question before I can yield my assent to this policy. Does this country now produce wool of any quality sufficient to give full employment to its manufacturing capital? If I can answer this question affirmatively, then I should certainly answer the other negatively; for I have already said, I consider the principle perfectly sound, that it is not, and cannot be, for the interest of this country, to import a foreign material for the use of her manufactories, when a full supply of the same material of domestic production may be obtained.

I will then, Mr. Chairman, endeavor to show that the United States do now produce, and will in all future time produce, as much wool as we have now, or shall have, capital to devote to the manufacture of this article; and as one mean of arriving at this conclusion, I will refer to the evidence taken before the Committee on Manufactures, to determine the present state of the wool-growing business in this country, and to see what the qualities and now relative prices of domestic wools are.

Hon. Nathaniel Garrow, of Auburn, Cayuga county, New York.

Q. Is the growing of wool a considerable business with the farmers in your section of the country?

A. It is.

Q. Where is the surplus of their wool marketed?

A. It is sold partly at Oriskany Factory, and some is sent to Rhode Island. But there is no good market for it. Many farmers now have on hand the fleeces of the last year.

Q. Is the number of sheep increasing or diminishing in your section of the country?

A. I should think the stock rather on the decline.

Simon N. Dexter, of Oriskany, Oneida county, New York.

Q. Do you find any difficulty in procuring as much domestic wool as is wanted at your factory, or is there a surplus?

A. There is a surplus of domestic growth.

Hon. Aaron Tuffts, of Dudley, Worcester county, Massachusetts.

Q. Is the growing of wool a considerable business with the farmers in the neighborhood of your factory; and is there a surplus of domestic wool in your neighborhood, over and above what is demanded by the manufacturers in the same section of the country?

A. The growing of wool is a considerable business with the farmers of my neighborhood, but they do not furnish a twentieth part of what is demanded by the manufacturers in the vicinity. The factories in that section of country are generally supplied with wool from Connecticut, the western part of Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, New York, and a small quantity from Pennsylvania. I have seen large quantities of wool from Ohio, in the Boston market; but I never bought any of it.

Q. Are you a wool grower? and, if you are, what number of sheep do you own, and what number of pounds do your flocks yield?

A. I am a wool grower, and own about 500 sheep. My flock consists of fine woolled sheep, but do not yield quite 2½lbs. of wool per head, on the back, well washed.

Q. Is the number of sheep increasing or diminishing in your section of country?

A. They increased very rapidly until the year 1826;—since which time many of the farmers have disposed of their flocks, and others seem disposed to do so, in consequence of the low price of wool. On the whole, I think the stock is diminishing.

Q. What quantity of the domestic wool stated by you to have been purchased in 1827, by the factory in which you are concerned, was supplied by sheep owned by you?

A. My own shearing of 1827 formed no part of what was furnished to the factory in which I am concerned. I have it still on hand. I supplied the factory in 1826 with 800 or 1000 pounds.

James Shepherd, of Northampton, Hampshire county, Massachusetts.

Q. Is the growing of wool a considerable business with the farmers in the neighborhood of your factory? and is there a surplus of domestic wool in your neighborhood, over and above what is demanded by the manufacturers in the same section of country?

A. It is a very extensive business, but there is a large deficiency in the section of country in which I reside, in the quantity grown, and what is wanted for manufacturing. That part of the country is supplied partly by imported wool, from other parts of Massachusetts, from other of the New-England States, and from New-York.

Q. Are you a wool grower? and, if you are, what number of sheep do you own, and what number of pounds of wool do your flocks yield?

A. I am a wool grower, and have now from 1200 to 1400 sheep, yielding about three pounds of wool each, on the average.

Q. Is the number of sheep increasing or diminishing in your section of country?

A. The number is diminishing fast.

William Phillips, of Phillipsburg, Orange County, New-York.

Q. Is the growing of wool a considerable business with the farmers in the neighborhood of your factory? and is there a surplus of domestic wool in your neighborhood, over and above what is demanded by the manufacturers in the same section of country?

A. It is an extensive business in Orange County.

Q. Are you a wool grower? and, if you are, how many sheep do you own, and what number of pounds of wool do your flocks yield?

A. I am a wool grower, and have between 600 and 700 sheep. It is generally estimated that they will yield three pounds each; but I think two and three quarter pounds is a more correct one. My brother, who has some connexion with me in business, has from 1000 to 1200 head of sheep. They yield in wool, I presume, about the same proportion, and the wool of both flocks is worked up in our factories.

Q. Is the number of sheep increasing or diminishing in your section of country?

A. I am of opinion that they are decreasing. Those who have small flocks will not keep them.

William R. Dickinson, of Steubenville, Ohio.

Q. Is the growing of wool a considerable business with the farmers in your section of country?

A. It is with a great number of farmers in my neighborhood, and especially since the passage of the tariff bill of 1824.

Q. Are you a wool grower? and, if so, what does it cost you a head, per annum, for keeping your sheep?

A. I am a wool grower, and so is my partner in the woollen manufactory. I own between 3000 and 4000 sheep. My partner owns about the same number that I do, but his flocks are not connected with mine. I estimate the cost per head of keeping sheep, in the part of the country where I live, at one dollar. I feel sure that it does not exceed that sum. The farmers in the country can keep sheep cheaper than I can.

Q. Is there in your section of country a surplus of domestic wool, over and above what is required by the manufactories in the same section?

A. There is an excess, which has been constantly increasing until the last year. My partner and myself have for the last three years, sent to the eastern markets, from 30,000 to 50,000 pounds annually. I speak from recollection, not having any data to refer to for this statement. Most of this wool has been sent to Boston, and has been of the coarser qualities; upon which we have invariably lost money until the last year, when I think we shall have saved ourselves. This wool is grown in western Virginia, western Pennsylvania, Ohio, and a small share of Kentucky.

Q. Is the number of sheep increasing or diminishing in your neighborhood?

A. The number of sheep was rapidly increasing in my section of country for the last three years, until the last year; but some of the

owners of sheep seem now to be disposed to diminish their flocks. The whole number of sheep, at the present time, is greater than it was one year ago.

Q. Can you speak with confidence as to what section of the United States is best adapted to the growing of wool to the greatest advantage?

A. My opinion is that the finer wools can be most plentifully and cheaply grown in western Virginia, western Pennsylvania, in parts of New-York, and in the northern part of Ohio.

Q. Have you any wool grown in your country equal to the best imported Saxony and Merino wool?

A. For my own part, I have no hesitation in saying that we have merino wool in the west, as fine as the best Saxony wool which I have ever seen, and I have examined many fine parcels. I have the testimony too, of Mr. Woods, our wool stapler, who served a regular apprenticeship in England, of seven years, and who has continued in the business of wool stapling in England, (where he handled the finest Saxony samples) and in the United States for the last twenty years. The quantity, however, is small, not amounting to more than 3 or 4000 pounds, out of a parcel of 80 or 100,000 pounds. It is increasing annually, and will increase, if the business is properly encouraged. The Saxony sheep is but an improvement on Spanish merino, by climate and attention; and the climate of my section of country is equally favorable to the improvement of our merino breed. Within the last thirteen years, I have discovered a decided improvement in the staple of our wool from our full blooded merinos.

Abraham Schenck, of Matteawan, Dutchess County, New-York.

Q. Is the growing of wool a considerable business with the farmers in your section of the country?

A. It is. I think the county in which I reside has 300,000 sheep, from the best information I have been able to obtain.

Q. Is there in your section of country a surplus of domestic wool, over and above what is required by the manufactories in the same section?

A. There is in my county a very large one. I have been informed, and believe it to be true, that some of the farmers have now *four crops on hand unsold*.

Q. Is the number of sheep increasing or diminishing in your neighborhood?

I should think they were rather diminishing than otherwise: but they may be about stationary.

James Wolcott, of Southbridge, Massachusetts.

Q. Is the growing of wool a considerable business in your State with the farmers?

A. In some of the western counties of the State it is, but not generally so.

Jonas B. Brown, of Boston, Massachusetts.

Q. Is the growing of wool a considerable business with the farmers of your State?

A. Amongst the western portion of them it is.

Joshua Clapp, of Boston, Massachusetts.

Q. Is the number of sheep increasing or diminishing in your neighborhood?

A. I think they have remained for some time at about the same number.

Eleuterre Irene Dupont, of New Castle County, Delaware.

Q. Are you a wool grower? If yea, what is the average expense to you, per head, of keeping your sheep, and what number do you keep?

A. I am a wool grower, and now keep about an hundred sheep. I formerly had about 1200 sheep. I purchased a farm to keep them upon, and have never estimated, therefore cannot state the expense per head of keeping them. The raising of sheep has been to me a losing business to a great extent.

Q. Is the growing of wool a considerable business with the farmers in your section of the country?

A. It is very limited.

Q. Is there in your section of country, a surplus of wool over and above what is required for the manufactories in your section of country?

A. I think there is no surplus, but there is on the contrary a deficiency.

Joseph W. Pierce, of Somersworth, Strafford County, New-Hampshire.

Q. Is the growing of wool a considerable business with the farmers in your section of country?

A. Not in our immediate neighborhood; but a good deal so in the upper counties of the State, in which I reside.

Q. Is there in your section of country a surplus of wool over and above what is required for the manufactories in that section of country?

A. There is not a surplus, but a very great deficiency.

This, Mr. Chairman, closes the information as to the wool growing business, which is to be derived from the testimony taken before the Committee on Manufactures. It does not contain any certain data from which to determine the whole quantity grown in the United States, but it does show that the deficiency is found only where most of the manufactories are located. The witnesses who testify are from widely distant sections of the country, and each speaks of the surplus or deficiency of his own section. From examining this testimony, it will be found that the deficiencies mostly exist in Massachusetts, where far the greatest number of manufactories are established, and in Delaware, where little wool is grown; while in Vermont, New-York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and the upper parts of New Hampshire, a greater or less surplus is found to counterbalance these deficiencies. It will also be found, as appears by the testimony of Mr. Dickinson, that when the coarse wools of the country are sent to our markets, they are sent at a loss; they do not sell, while the foreign coarse wools do sell.

But, Sir, I have endeavored to find data from which a calculation of wool grown in the country might be made, and I have adopted the most certain which I have been able to discover. I am free to confess

that this is vague and uncertain, but I have searched for better in vain: it is not within my reach, and I do not believe it to be within that of any man. I have, however, made a partial calculation, which I will give to the committee, together with the data upon which it is founded. In 1825, a census of the State which I have the honor in part to represent, was taken, and by the law directing the taking of that census, certain statistical information of that State was also directed to be obtained, by the persons appointed to take that census. Among the facts thus obtained, and I cannot doubt, correctly obtained, an enumeration of the sheep then in State theof New York was taken, and it was found to be 3,496,539. Since that time, it is equally difficult, if not impossible, to tell with certainty the rates of increase, and of consequence, to determine the present number. I have, however, supposed what may, and what may not, be true, that the six New England States, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Delaware and Maryland, possessed an equal number of sheep, in proportion to their population with New York, in the year 1825. These States then, would, in 1825, have possessed 10,313,139 sheep. I doubt whether the State of New York at that time exceeded in its number of sheep, the ratio of the other States named; but when, in the calculation, the remaining States, contrary to what is known to be true, are supposed to possess no sheep at all, this allowance must surely be sufficiently large to cover any excess, if any existed, in the ratio of New York; and the calculation must be safe against the danger of producing too large a result. The whole number of sheep, then, in 1825, in the United States, would be 13,809,678.

As the only rule upon which the increase, since that time, can be calculated with any safety, I have taken the testimony of Mr. Schenck, to which I have before referred. By the census of New York, to which I have just referred, it will be found that there were in the county of Dutchess, in that State, the county in which Mr. Schenck resides, in 1825, 174,010 sheep. Mr. Schenck now testifies that there are, according to the best information he has been able to obtain, in that county, at this time, 300,000 sheep making an increase, since 1825, of something more than 70 per cent. That county is a wealthy and extensively agricultural county, and it is surrounded with others equally so, in proportion to their population; and I know not why the rate of increase of sheep in this county, since 1825, should not be good evidence of the rate of increase in the neighboring counties, and, indeed, in the whole State. I therefore assume that the increase of this kind of property in New York has been 70 per cent. since the taking of the enumeration of them in 1825. By the same census, the number of yards of cloth manufactured in the domestic way, and not including that manufactured in the manufacturing establishments, together with the various descriptions, so manufactured, was ascertained. Determining, then, as nearly as I can, from the testimony taken before the Committee on Manufactures, the quantity of wool which would be consumed to make the cloth manufactured in the domestic way in that State, I find that New York alone would, in 1825, have afforded two millions, and, perhaps, two and a half millions pounds of wool, for the use of

the manufactories of the country, beyond what was required for the domestic or family consumption. But New York then possessed less than one-fourth of the whole number of sheep, according to the calculation I have made; and if the other States, named as wool-growing States, did, at that time, furnish as large a surplus, over and above the wool manufactured in the domestic way, in proportion to their respective populations, as did New York, how would this whole surplus, appropriated to the use of the manufactories, compare with the quantity they require?

The whole amount of woollen goods consumed in this country are variously estimated at from fifty to sixty millions of dollars in value. One of the witnesses, and the only one, I think, who makes an estimate upon it, puts the value at fifty millions. The honorable chairman, (Mr. Mallary,) says, he has seen an estimate at sixty-two millions. Suppose sixty millions to be the correct amount consumed. Of these, near ten millions, or between eight and ten millions, are imported; leaving not far from fifty millions to be, and which now are, manufactured in the country. What value of wool, then, is required to make this value of goods? By the testimony it will be seen that the value of the wool, as a general rule for this country, at present prices, is about one-half the value of the cloth it makes. The value of the wool, then, to make fifty millions of dollars worth of cloths, will be twenty-five millions of dollars. The wool produced in the country, according to the data and principles of calculation I have before assumed, will stand as follows:

In 1825, the number of sheep above given,	-	13,809,678
Add 70 per cent. upon this number for the increase up to the present time, as obtained from the testimony as to Dutchess county, New-York,	-	9,666,774
And the whole number of sheep will now be,	-	<u>23,476,452</u>

Multiply this whole number of sheep by two and one-half, the pounds of wool which each sheep, as appears by the testimony, will yield annually, and the whole quantity of wool grown in the United States, at the present time, will be 58,691,130 pounds.

I admit, Sir, that all calculations of this kind are uncertain, and subject to considerable errors; but when it is remembered that this is made without any allowance for the sheep raised in the States south and west of those before named, of which there are known to be considerable numbers, and when it is proved by the testimony that many of the farmers have now on hand and unsold the shearings of from one to four years, I cannot doubt that this calculation is sufficiently small, and that the annual growth of wool in the United States, and the surplus now in the country unsold, must swell the value of the domestic wool at least to reach the present consumption.

As corroborating this estimate, I ask leave, Sir, to refer to one of the memorials upon this subject, which has been printed and laid upon our tables since this bill was reported to the House. This memorial

comes from a county of my own State, (Otsego,) second to few, and perhaps to none in it, in the extent and importance of its agricultural and manufacturing pursuits; and its language is as follows:

“The present number of sheep in the United States cannot be less than 20,000,000, and a steady market for wool would ensure their being *double in number in three years*. There is at this moment on hand, awaiting a favorable market, at least 20,000,000 lbs.; which, being added to the products of 20,000,000 sheep, we shall have, on the first of June next, 70,000,000 lbs.; which will be more than a supply of the raw material.”

This, Mr. Chairman, strongly confirms me in the correctness of my own estimates; and if either be substantially correct in its results, the country does produce wool enough for the cloth she makes; and if enough for present demand is produced, no one can doubt the ability to extend the growing of wool even more rapidly than the manufactories can be increased by the present capital seeking that investment.

But, notwithstanding these evidences that the United States do produce a full supply of domestic wool, large quantities of foreign wool are annually imported; and one evidence that those importations do conflict with the domestic wool, is furnished in the fact, that very little or no coarse common domestic wool is purchased by the factories on the sea-board, where the coarse imported wools are readily obtained. The evidence of the importations is furnished in the Executive reports of the importations into the United States for the several years, by reference to which it will be seen that the value of these importations of wool, from 1822 to this time, have varied from about \$350,000 to about \$550,000 annually.

This wool must conflict with the wool of the country, if it be true that the country produces a supply; and it must affect the price far beyond its proportionable value, inasmuch as a surplus in the market, however small, sinks the price of the whole commodity. This wool also conflicts with the domestic, by supplying the very same market which the domestic wool ought to supply. This must be true, unless there are qualities imported answering a different purpose from that to which any domestic wool can be applied. But, Sir, as I have before said, the manufactories upon the sea-board use none of the coarse domestic wools of the country; while those in the interior do use these coarse wools for the same purposes for which the others use the imported coarse wools. For proof of this I refer to the testimony again.

Mr. Dexter, (the factory located in the interior of New-York,) says, “we have worked no foreign wool in that time”—three years last past—“except one lot of Saxony, which was probably from 3 to 6,000 lbs. Our purchases have been made exclusively from the farmers and in the fleece. The Saxony wool cost more than a dollar per pound.” Again, he says, “the lowest prices of that brought to the factory for the last year has been from 18 to 20 cents per pound. There is some grown among the farmers even coarser than this; but I do not know that its price would vary materially from this. This wool forms only a small share of what is raised in the country, and most of

it is raised in the back settlements, and for domestic use. About one-eighth of the wool purchased at the Oriskany Factory is of this quality."

"*Mr. Tuffts*—(Factory located near Boston,) says, the coarse or domestic native wool in the fleece, is worth in our market or delivered at our factories, from 20 to 25 cents per lb. *We do not purchase any of it.*"

"*Mr. Shepherd*—(Factory located at Northampton, Massachusetts,) says it has always been my object to purchase the finest wool, foreign and domestic, which the market would afford. I have purchased *very little native wool* of the low or inferior quality."

"*Mr. Phillips*—(Factory located in Orange County, New-York,) says, "we have worked no imported wool within the last three years. Our consumption has been exclusively of domestic growth; purchased in the fleece most usually."

Again he says, "We have worked full blooded merino, and from that down to half blood. *A small quantity* of native wool only has been used."

Mr. Young—(Factory located near Wilmington, Delaware,) says, "It has always been our intention to purchase the fine qualities of wool, and we have adhered to that intention as far as practicable. In 1825 we paid for what is called full blooded American merino, in the fleece, entirely unwashed, or in the yolk, an average of 40 cents per lb.—For coarse German wools, cleaned upon the sheep, in the fleece, from 16 to 20 cents per lb." Again question—"What is the present price in the American markets of common domestic wool of native growth?" Answer—"I am not able to state the price."

Mr. Dickinson. (Factory located at Steubenville, Ohio.)

Question—"What were the relative qualities and prices of the raw material consumed in your factory?"

Answer—"In the quantity before supposed to be the average consumed (35,000 lbs.) the qualities would be about the following, viz: 3,000 pounds of common native wool, &c." Again:

Question—"What proportion of this raw material was imported, and what proportion was of domestic production?"

Answer—"All domestic."

Mr. Schenck—(Factory located at Matteawan, Dutchess County, New York.)

Question—"What has been the average quantity of wool consumed for the last three years in your factory?"

Answer—"I cannot tell the quantity of wool we have used for the last three years: but from the 3d June, 1826, to 3d June, 1827, by the accounts from our books, it appears that we consumed 70,400 pounds of merino fleece wool, as washed upon the sheep. In the same time, we consumed about 5000 pounds coarse Buenos Ayres wool, for listings, headings, and the like." Again,

"It was all domestic wool, *except the 5000 pounds of coarse wool* mentioned in the last answer." Again,

Question. "What is the present price in the American markets of common domestic wool of native growth?"

Answer—"I do not know; but, from the best information I have, it is from 20 to 25 cents per pound."

Mr. Dupont—(Factory located near Wilmington, Delaware,) says: "The most of the wool we have used has been the native wool of this country, and the residue coarse Smyrna and South American wool. In 1825 we paid about 35 cents for pulled wool, which we mostly used. In 1826, I cannot say what price we paid. In 1827, we paid for the same kind of wool, from about 25 to 30 cents per pound. I think the price has gradually fallen, from 1825 to this time. I think we have paid from 16 to 22 cents for the Smyrna wool, and about the same for the South American wool."

Mr. Pierce—(Factory located at Somersworth, Strafford county, New Hampshire.)

Question—"What is the general quality of the wool you work, and what have been the average prices paid for it for the last three years?"

Answer—"We have for the last three years purchased and used a variety of qualities of wool, and our extremes in price, in 1825, were from 90 cents to 22 cents per pound for foreign wool, as nearly as my memory will enable me to speak. In this year our fine wool was Spanish, and the coarse was (I think) Adrianople. We paid this year for our domestic wool from 25 to 62½ cents per pound, according to my recollection. In 1826, we paid from 12½ to 96 cents for our foreign wool. The fine this year was Saxony, and the coarse Portuguese. For our domestic this year, we paid from 20 to 55 cents per pound. The domestic wool which we purchased this year, at 55 cents, was better than that we purchased the preceding year at 62½ cents per pound. In 1827, we paid for our foreign wools, from 61 to 74 cents per pound, it being all fine Saxony wool. For our domestic wool this year we paid from 17 to 45 cents per pound."

The price of the coarsest or lowest priced wool, spoken of by Mr. Wolcott is 32½ cents per pound; by Mr. Brown 37½ cents per pound; by Mr. Clapp 34 cents per pound; and Mr. Poor says, "We used a fraction more than half of foreign wool in 1827. I cannot speak as to any other year." But he does not speak of the price of the wool used.

I am aware, Mr. Chairman, that this reference to the testimony is tedious and irksome to the Committee; but, Sir, I cannot discharge what I believe to be my duty, without making it. I wish to examine the bill reported by the Committee, and the amendment offered by the Hon. Chairman, (Mr. Mallary,) with express reference to it, and to the facts elicited by it. And taking the references I have just made, I ask where is the evidence of the want of foreign coarse wool? How many of the factories spoken of by these witnesses purchase any of the coarse domestic wools? Mr. Dexter and Mr. Dickinson are in the interior, and they use entirely domestic wools of all qualities. Nearly all the witnesses are employed in making fine cloths, either broadcloths or cassimeres, and of the same descriptions. Nearly all use the fine domestic wools, but most of them use the foreign coarse wools for listings, headings, and the like; a use for which the domestic coarse wools will answer an equally valuable purpose, as is shown by the fact, that the fac-

tories in the interior do make that use of it. But some of the witnesses, differently situated, swear expressly that they do not purchase it, and others, that they do not know its market price, which is equally evidence that it is not used in their factories. Others testify expressly to the use of the foreign coarse wools instead of the domestic.

It has been said, that for the manufacture of carpets, domestic wool cannot be used; that the price will be so high as to render it impossible to make the fabric at a reasonable value. From an examination of the testimony, does it appear that the foreign imported coarse wools are materially lower in price than the domestic? Will it not be found that domestic wools will be obtained in the course of manufacture as cheap as the foreign wools here mentioned? I believe, Sir, I shall be able to show that they may be so obtained, that they must be fit for carpetings, and that their prices will not be higher than the average prices of the foreign wools.

Another and principal reason which induced me, and which I think influenced the majority of the Committee to believe it necessary to change and increase the duty upon the coarse imported wools, is the confirmed opinion that many of these importations are made in evasion of the spirit of the existing laws, and that, by this means, qualities of wool are actually imported, invoiced at ten cents per pound, which conflict with wools of an entirely superior quality. For the evidence upon which this opinion is founded, I again refer to the printed testimony, and first to that of

Mr. Tuffts—who says, “the largest *quantity* imported, sells from 10 to 16 cents per pound in Boston.” Next:

Mr. Shepherd—who says, “coarse and fine wools are imported principally. The coarse wools are worth from 10 to 15 cents. In the Boston market, the usual prices of the fine wool are from 60 to \$1 65.” Next:

Mr. Clapp—who says, “Almost every kind of wool is imported. Very coarse wools are received from South America, and Smyrna, and *these form the largest proportion.*”

I refer also to an entry made in the printed testimony of *Mr. Tuffts*, page 44, and which is in the following words: “The witness presented to the Committee several samples of wool, with the following explanation:

Barbary wool, present price in Boston, 6 cents per lb.

1. Smyrna,	do	do	12
2. do	do	do	9½
Russia,	do	do	13½
Adrianople,	do	do	14

The Russian sample, and No. 1. parcel of the Smyrna he thinks have been washed—the other has not.”

Here we have the evidence of the witness, that the largest *quantities* of the wool imported are of these coarse qualities, and invoiced at and below ten cents per pound. Of the samples of wool here spoken of, and which were frankly and generously prepared for the purpose, and exhibited to the Committee by the Hon. *Mr. Tuffts*, I confess,

Mr. Chairman, no judgment can be formed except from actual inspection, and examination. I have examined them. They have been, and I believe now are in the room of the Committee on Manufactures, where I hope many others have, or will examine them. I may be entirely mistaken in the judgment I have formed, and I certainly am not acquainted, to any considerable extent, with the different qualities of wools; but I am perfectly satisfied for myself, that at least two of these samples of wool are fully equal for all purposes of use, to much of the native wool of the country. Some of them have evidently not been cleansed at all; but, upon being cleansed and assorted, I cannot doubt that a large share of one of these samples of wool would be found fit to go into the manufacture of middling quality cloths. This, then, compels me to conclude that wools of these qualities, at least, must conflict with the coarse wools grown in this country. I may have misjudged as to the quality of these samples of wool; but, under my present impressions, the conclusion is irresistible.

But, Sir, in corroboration of the testimony of the witnesses as to the relative quantities and qualities of the imported wools, and as the highest evidence upon this subject, I have referred to the Executive reports of the importation into the United States for several years, now last past, and will trouble the Committee with a statement of the importations of wool for those years. It will be seen by the table that the qualities of the wools were not distinguished, or, that no distinction between wool costing abroad 10 cents and under per pound, and that costing a greater sum, was made until 1825, the year after the passage of the tariff of 1824. The quantity in pounds of the wool imported is given in 1822, and 1823, but not after. The importations from 1822 to 1827, both inclusive, have been as follows:

		<i>Quantity lbs.</i>	<i>Value.</i>	<i>Total value.</i>
1822.	Wool imported,	1,733,420	\$387,312	
1823.	do do	1,674,348	340,956	
1824.	do do	not given	355,034	
1825 {	do over 10 cts. lb.	do	515,926	\$569,476
	do under 10 do	do	53,550	
1826 {	do over 10 do	do	343,021	449,725
	do under 10 do	do	106,704	
1827 {	do over 10 do	do	233,739	408,527
	do under 10 do	do	174,788	

A comparison of these importations will show that the value of the imported wool in 1823 and 1824, was a little less in each year than the value for 1822; that in 1825, it was much larger than any former year. This was the first year after the passage of the tariff of 1824, and the first year of the fair operation of that law upon the importation of wool. What were its effects in that year, and what changes have been produced by experience? By that law, all wool at and under 10 cents per pound, were to pay a duty of 15 per cent. ad valorem, and all costing over that sum, double that duty. In 1825, the wool imported costing over 10 cents, was valued at \$515,926, and that costing under 10 cents, at \$53,550. The next year, the imported wool

costing over 10 cents was valued at \$343,021; nearly \$200,000 less than the preceding year; while that costing 10 cents and under, was valued at \$106,704; almost double the preceding year. But this effect has not been peculiar to those two years. It still continues, and is found to nearly as great an extent in a comparison between 1826 and 1827. The importations of wool costing over 10 cents in 1827, are valued at \$233,739, nearly \$110,000 less than in 1826; while the importations in 1827, of wool costing 10 cents and under, are valued at \$174,788, nearly \$70,000 greater than in 1826.

Now, Sir, I ask, is there any evidence that the manufacture of coarse wool has increased in proportion to this increase of the importation of the material? If there is, I have not heard of it. From all the witnesses examined by the Committee on Manufactures, I have heard of but one factory exclusively employed in the manufacture of these coarse wools, and of that I have heard as matter of history, and not of evidence; yet I do not doubt the fact, that there is an extensive manufactory of negro cloths, so called, at a place called Canton, in Massachusetts. The Committee have not been fortunate enough to reach a single witness engaged in this manufacture. This is no doubt to be lamented; and, had their acquaintance with the manufacturers been more extensive, might have been obviated. But so is the fact, and an examination of the testimony taken by them, will show that nearly every witness is employed in the manufacture of the finer wools. Why, then, this rapid increase of the importation of coarse wools? One manufactory cannot require it. There is, then, but one way to explain it; and that is partially explained by the samples of the coarse imported wools presented to the Committee on Manufactures. Two of these samples I have already declared, in my judgment, to be equal, if not superior, to samples which may be obtained of domestic wool. How, then, it will be asked, is it imported at an invoice of 10 cents per pound? I answer—The appearance of most of the samples of this wool is bad. It is imported entirely uncleansed, even upon the sheep. The quality is thus disguised, unless the closest inspection is had, and even then its true character may not be discovered. But I do say, it is, in my opinion, equal to much of the wool grown in this country. What, then, is the effect of importing this wool in this state? Suppose it were cleansed and assorted before importation, as most of the foreign wools are. If the quality be really such as I suppose, and if it should be prepared in this manner before importation, much less of it would come to the country at all. It must, therefore, come in evasion of the existing law, and we cannot admit it, unless we wish it should compete with our own wool in our own markets.

But, Sir, the difference in quality of the foreign wool introduced into the country by this change, in the course of importation, is worthy of notice. The quantity of wool imported into this country in 1822 and 1823, I have before given, and I will repeat them, and compare those quantities with the number of pounds imported in 1825, 1826, and 1827, supposing that costing more than 10 cents per pound to average 50 cents per pound, and that costing 10 cents and under

per pound, to average 7 cents per pound. These averages will at least be proportionably correct, for the years to which they apply, and cannot, I presume, be considered far from correct in the comparison with former years, when it shall be seen that some of the coarse wool sells in our markets, after paying duty and charges, as low as 6 cents, and that very little of the fine sells at a less price than 60 cents per pound. I have been compelled to make this statement in a tabular form, to render it intelligible, and so I will give it to the Committee:

	Value, Dolls.	Pounds of each; at 50 cts. fine, & 7 cts. coarse.	Total number of lbs. imported in each year.
There was imported in 1822,	387,312	not disting.	1,733,420
Do. do. 1823,	340,956	do. do.	1,674,348
1825 { do. over 10 cts. per lb.,	515,926	1,031,852 }	1,796,852
{ do. under 10 cts. per lb.,	53,550	765,000 }	
1826 { do. over 10 cts. per lb.,	343,021	686,042 }	2,210,385
{ do. under 10 cts. per lb.,	106,704	1,524,343 }	
1827 { do. over 10 cts. per lb.,	233,739	467,478 }	2,964,449
{ do. under 10 cts. per lb.,	174,788	2,496,971 }	

By this comparison it will be seen, not only that the quantity of wool imported during the last years, is considerably greater than the quantity imported in 1822 and 1823, but that the quantity imported in 1827 has been greater than that imported in 1825, by nearly 1,200,000 pounds; and this too, although the value of the importations has been greatly diminished between the two years last mentioned. Is not this almost conclusive evidence that frauds must be practised in the introduction of this coarse wool?

But the honorable chairman (Mr. Mallary) alleges that most of the domestic wool is of finer quality than the native wool of the country; that the present flocks of sheep are mostly of mixed or full bloods, and that little of the coarse wool is raised. He, Sir, is a practical wool grower, and should be better acquainted with these facts than myself; and I am free to admit that it must be the interest of the wool grower to make his flock as good as he can; to improve the quality of his wool until it reaches the finest point. But is this the state of the flocks at present in this country? So far as my knowledge extends, it is not. The flocks are not now Merino or Saxony. At least, Sir, they are not in the district which I represent. Sir, the great body of the farmers of my district are men of small estates. The capital required to purchase flocks of these sheep, they do not—they cannot possess. The only means they have to obtain them is by ingrafting them upon their present common stock; by crossing them with the breeds of common sheep, and improving the quality of their wool in that manner. These are the reasons which have operated upon my mind to induce me to wish to extend strong encouragement to the common flocks and common wool. But, Sir, destroy the flocks of common sheep, and what will be the consequence? One of the witnesses has answered the question: “those who have small flocks will not keep them;” the business

of wool growing must go into the hands of the capitalist. Protect only the Merino and other fine wools, and the moderate farmer will be excluded from the benefit. Extend your protection to the ordinary farmers of the country; let them be thoroughly protected, and your flocks will become again flourishing and numerous; they will be improved in kind and quality as well as in numbers.

But it has been said the demand for these coarse wools cannot be supplied by the native wools of the country. Is this so? To answer this question I only ask a general reference again to the testimony. The foreign coarse wools now sell in our markets at from 10 to 16 cents per pound, generally, though some of it sells as low as 6 cents per pound. This is established by the testimony of Mr. Tuffits, to which I have before referred, presenting samples of imported wool, now selling in the Boston market at from 6 to 14 cents per pound, and again saying, "the largest quantity imported sells from 10 to 16 cents per pound in Boston;" by the testimony of Mr. Schenck, saying, "the average cost of the Buenos Ayres wool was from 8 to 12 cents per pound, according to my best recollection;" and by the testimony of Mr. Brown, saying, "coarse and fine wools are imported principally. The coarse wools are worth from 10 to 15 cents." What are the prices in the same markets of the domestic coarse wools? This is also answered by the testimony, with a reference to which I must trouble the Committee. The following question, in substance, if not in words, was put by the Committee to each of the following witnesses, and their respective answers I will give in an abridged form:

Question—"What is the price, in the American markets, of the common domestic wool, in the fleece?"

Mr. Dexter answers, for the last year, from 18 to 20 cents per lb.

Mr. Tuffits	do.	do.	20 to 25	do.
-------------	-----	-----	----------	-----

Mr. Shepherd	do.	do.	about 25	do.
--------------	-----	-----	----------	-----

Mr. Phillips	do.	do.	18 to 25	do.
--------------	-----	-----	----------	-----

Mr. Morland, (speaks of pulled wool,)			25 to 28	do.
---------------------------------------	--	--	----------	-----

Mr. Dickinson	do.	do.	20	do.
---------------	-----	-----	----	-----

Mr. Schenck	do.	do.	20 to 25	do.
-------------	-----	-----	----------	-----

Mr. Wolcott	do.	do.	20 to 25	do.
-------------	-----	-----	----------	-----

Mr. Brown	do.	do.	20 to 24	do.
-----------	-----	-----	----------	-----

Mr. Clapp	do.	do.	20 to 25	do.
-----------	-----	-----	----------	-----

Mr. Dupont	do.	do.	20 to 25	do.
------------	-----	-----	----------	-----

Mr. Peirce	do.	do.	17 to 20	do.
------------	-----	-----	----------	-----

Upon reference to the language of the witnesses themselves, it will be found that many of them do not pretend to speak from knowledge, but from information; as many of them do not purchase this description of wool; while others speak of the prices which they actually pay. Mr. Dexter, Mr. Dickinson, and Mr. Peirce, are among the latter; and from their testimony, 20 cents per pound will be high as an average price of the domestic native wool. The extremes are from 17 to 25 cents, with the exception of the witness Morland, who will be found to speak of pulled or skin wool, that being the wool he uses.

The foreign coarse wool, then, is now generally selling in our markets at from 10 to 16 cents per pound, and the coarse native wools of the country at from 17 to 25 cents per pound. The average may be called 13 cents for the foreign, and 20 cents for the domestic wool. In what state are these wools, respectively, when spoken of at these prices? These foreign wools, we have already seen, are imported entirely uncleaned, and in the grease and dirt; and the testimony will show that nearly one-half is lost in cleansing; while all the witnesses speak of the domestic coarse wools in the fleece, and as cleansed by washing upon the sheep's back. They speak also, not only of the whole native fleeces, but of the product of whole flocks of native sheep, as sold by the quantity, and embracing all the qualities which a flock will necessarily furnish. What, then, would be the result of the manufacture of this wool into cloth, we shall presently see.

I have already examined the testimony with reference to the demand for this native wool; and the result has been found to be, that very few of the factories spoken of by the witnesses use it at all, and the others use but a very small share of it. Little demand, therefore, exists for it in our markets, although the foreign coarse wools sell readily. The only reason assigned for this is, that the coarse domestic wools bear so high a price as not to warrant their purchase by the manufacturer. If this objection has not been already obviated by showing the relative prices of these coarse wools, and the different conditions, as to cleanliness, in which they are found in the market, there is still another consideration, which, to my mind, fully answers the difficulty. These domestic wools are to be assorted for manufacture; and what then will be the relative quantity and value of the several parcels or qualities thus produced? A reference again to the testimony is necessary to establish this point.

Mr. Dexter. Question—"Into how many parcels or qualities is each fleece of wool assorted at the factory, for the purpose of manufacture; and what will be the difference in value between the best and poorest quality in the same fleece?"

Answer.—"I am not an operator in wool, and cannot speak positively; but I think there are six distinct qualities or classes into which the wool is assorted after it is purchased. To suppose a lot of 100 pounds of prime wool, at 35 cents; there is probably five pounds of the best quality, called picklock, and this is worth \$1 40 cents per pound. The second quality is called superfine, and of this there will be something like 12 pounds, and this I presume to be worth 65 cents per pound. Of the third quality, called fine wool, there will probably be 40 pounds, and this is worth about 40 cents per pound. The fourth class or quality, is, I think, called downright; of this there will be about 40 pounds, and worth about 20 cents per pound; the small remainder is very inferior, worth from 6 to 8 cents per pound, and is exclusively used for listings, &c. I now speak in reference to the prices and value in 1827."

It will be remarked that Mr. Dexter in this answer declares that he is not himself a practical manufacturer. I feel bound to add, in justice

to him, that the subpoena of the committee reached Mr. Dexter in the State of Delaware, some hundreds of miles from his factory, where he has been employed for two or three years past; that therefore he testifies entirely from memory, having had no access to the books and papers of the factory of which he speaks, after he was summoned to attend before the committee. He is, however, and has been a stockholder, and an active director of the establishment, and a careful examination of his answers will show a general knowledge of the subject, and a frankness and intelligence, which, if not so correct in the minute details of the business, will ensure as strong a credit as any witness who has appeared before the committee.

It appears, then, from his testimony, that out of 100 pounds of wool, worth 35 cents per pound, in the assortment, 40 pounds will be obtained worth only 20 cents per pound, falling exactly into the average price of the coarse native wools of the country. If then this large division of 100 pounds of wool, worth 35 cents per pound, is reduced by assortment from 35 to 20 cents, what I ask will be the effect of assorting a lot of wool, worth in the lot only 20 cents? Will it not, must it not be, to reduce an equally large share of it to 15—nay, sir, to 12 cents? and if to 12 cents per pound, then to and below the average price of the foreign imported coarse wools? But, Mr. Chairman, I have further reference to make to the testimony upon this point.

Mr. Tuffts. Question.—“Into how many parcels or qualities is each fleece of wool generally assorted at the factory, for the purpose of manufacture; and what will be the difference in value between the best and the poorest quality from the same fleece?”

Answer.—“Some fleeces make more parcels than others. We never make more than nine parcels at our factory. Some fleeces make not more than two. The finest parcel, which is called picklock, is worth a dollar and twenty cents per pound; of this there is but little. The ninth, or lowest quality, would not be worth more than ten cents. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the character or quantity of the intermediate qualities to fix their respective prices: for I am not a practical operator.”

This witness, it will be seen by examining his precedent testimony, has reference to wool worth in the fleece $37\frac{3}{4}$ cents per pound.

Mr. Shepherd. Question.—“Into how many parcels or qualities is the wool usually assorted at the factory, for the purpose of manufacture: and what will be the difference in value between the best and poorest qualities?”

Answer.—“I have divided the American wool into the following parcels, viz: picklock, prime, and Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6: then livery, listing, head, neck, fribs and skirting. Some foreign wool we purchase assorted, and some in the fleece: Saxony particularly. Of this, such as is bought in the fleece is assorted into four parcels, denominated 1, 2, 3, 4, qualities. Spanish wool is bought assorted into qualities marked R, F, T and S. Since the 1st July last, I have been in the habit of buying American wool assorted, and selling it assorted, picklocks, at one dollar per pound; prime, at 90 cents; No. 1

at 80 cents; No. 2, at 70 cents; No. 3, at 55 cents; No. 4, at 40 cents; No. 5, at 35 cents; No. 6, at 25 cents; and listing at 20 cents. The profits upon this business have netted me about five per cent. for the last six months. The relative quantity of the several parcels, when assorted, depends on the quality of the wools."

This witness refers to wool costing from 45 to 65 cents per pound in the fleece, and averaging about 55 cents, as will be seen by his former answers. It is also worthy of remark, that while he sells the lowest quality of this wool mentioned, at 20 cents per pound, there are in his assortments for manufacture, at least four qualities of a still coarser description.

Mr. Schenck. Question.—“What were the relative qualities and prices of the raw material consumed in this factory?

Answer.—“The quality of the wool we use is purchased as full blooded merino, and for which we pay an average price of 40 cents per pound. This wool is assorted, at our factory, into the following qualities, and valued at the following relative prices, viz: taking 80,000 pounds, which we have actually purchased at this average price, it will stand as follows:

400 lbs.	picklock,	valued at \$1 20,	amounts to	\$ 380 00
11,600 lbs.	No. 1,	do,	60, do.	6,960 00
36,000 lbs.	2,	do.	40, do.	14,400 00
24,000 lbs.	3,	do.	34, do.	8,160 00
8,000 lbs.	4, or livery,	do.	25, do.	2,000 00
				<hr/>
				\$ 32,000 00."

This factory makes but five sorts, or qualities, and yet the tenth part of wool worth 40 cents per pound is reduced to 25 cents in value, and still this quality or denomination is the sixth from the coarsest made by assortment in some of the factories.

The first witness, then, Mr. Chairman, in assorting a lot of wool worth 35 cents per pound, reduces $\frac{40}{100}$ ths of it to 20 cents per pound, and a small share of it even as low as from 6 to 8 cents; the second, in assorting a lot worth $37\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound, says—*the lowest quality would not be worth more than ten cents*: the third, in assorting a lot worth 55 cents per pound, not for manufacture, but for market, sells the lowest quality, thus assorted, at 20 cents per pound; and the fourth witness, and the last I shall refer to upon this head, in assorting into merely five qualities, a large lot of full blooded merino, reduces one-tenth part of it to 25 cents per pound. I then, again, ask, Sir, what will be the result of an assortment of the native wools of the country, as purchased in large quantities at the present prices? In the fleece washed, I have shown it to be worth 20 cents per pound. The inevitable effect of assorting it must be, that a very large share, if not the full half, must be reduced within the very prices at which the great body of the foreign wools are proved to be selling in our own markets; a very large share of these wools, when assorted, must be reduced in value to from 10 to 16 cents per pound.

If I am at all correct in this, I now ask, Sir, what is the practical effect of the importation of these coarse wools? This effect must be double, and must operate both ways. I have examined the effect of assorting our own coarse wools. But these foreign coarse wools, when properly cleansed, must also be assorted. By this process the finer qualities must be valued from 18 to 25 cents, the present prices of our coarse wools in the fleece, so that the conflict must be not only certain, but double, between these wools and the native wool of this country. I am aware I shall be met with the allegation, that the quantity of coarse wool obtained, by the assortment of our wools, is small. In the finer qualities I know it is, but the testimony just referred to furnishes the best data for settling this point.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, I have another answer to this objection, which is, that so far as the Committee on Manufactures have been able to learn, the great body of the factories of the country are employed in the manufacture of the finer wools, and therefore the want of a supply of coarse wool is much less to be apprehended; and the exclusion of the foreign coarse wools, even if that should be the effect of the provision recommended by the Committee, is much less a subject of alarm and apprehension. Most of the testimony to establish this point has been already referred to, and I will now only detain the Committee by a very short repetition of it. The same question, in substance, if not in form, was put by the Committee to all the witnesses, to whose testimony I shall refer, and was:—

Question. “What has been the quality of the wool mostly purchased for the use of your factory, and what have been the average prices per pound paid at the factory for the last three years?”

The answers relating directly to the point for which I now refer to them, are as follows:

Mr. Dexter—“The wool has been generally from three-quarters to full-blooded merino; some little of the half-blood may have been purchased three years ago. It was, however, but little.”

Mr. Dexter gives the average prices for 1825, at 65 cents; for 1826 at 50 cents; and for 1827 at 35 cents, and says, “for a better quality than that which cost 65 cents in 1825.”

Mr. Tuffts—“Between June, 1826, and July, 1827, the average price of American wool, purchased by us, was thirty-seven and three-quarters cents. It was the intention to purchase none inferior to three-quarters merino, though it is likely all was not as good as that. We intended to purchase from three-quarters to full-blood, or the best quality. During the same period, the average cost of foreign wool was 38½ cents. I do not think the foreign purchase so fair as the domestic growth, but there was less waste in cleansing it.”

Mr. Shepherd—“It has always been my object to purchase the finest wool, foreign and domestic, which the market would afford. I have purchased very little native wool of the low or inferior quality. The quality and average prices have been stated in my answer to the last interrogatory.”

The prices given by Mr. Shepherd, and to which he refers, are— for American wool from 45 to 65 cents, and for imported wool from 85 to 114 cents.

Mr. Phillips—“We have worked full blooded merino, and from that down to half-blood. A small quantity of native wool only has been used. In 1825 the average price was 53 cents, or nearly that. In 1826 it cost about 38 cents. In 1827 we procured it for 37 cents. These prices were paid for wool washed on the sheep, and delivered at the factory.”

Mr. Marland—“My intention has been to purchase various qualities of wool; about one-half of the whole has been first quality lamb’s wool, and the price of this, in 1825, was, on the average, about 52 to 55 cents per pound. In 1826, the same quality was about 40 cents, and in 1827 the same quality was about 35 to 37½ cents per pound. The next kind is what we call first quality spinning wool; then second quality lamb’s wool; and then fleece wool sheared. These last three qualities are used in about equal quantities. The price of the spinning wool was, in 1825, from 40 to 42 cents per pound; that of the second quality lamb’s wool was from 30 to 33 cents per pound; and the fleece wool was about 40 cents per pound. In 1826 the first quality of spinning wool was about 35 to 37½ cents per pound; second quality of lamb’s wool 28 to 30 cents per pound, and the fleece wool about 37 cents. In 1827, the first quality of spinning wool was about 30 cents per pound; lamb’s wool 25 cents per pound, and fleece wool from 25 to 27 cents, native fleeces.”

Mr. Young—“It has always been our intention to purchase the finer qualities of wool, and we have adhered to that intention as far as practicable.”

Mr. Young gives the prices they paid in 1825 for American wool, entirely unclesaned, from 40 to 50 cents per pound, and for coarse German wools washed upon the sheep, from 16 to 20 cents. In 1826 for American wool unclesaned, 33½ cents per pound, and for imported wools, Saxony and Spanish R. from 66½ to 125 per pound. In 1827 the American wool, washed on the sheep, 35 cents per pound. Spanish R. wool, 57½ cents per pound. Portugal R. wool 31½ cents per pound; American assorted wool, No. 1, \$1 25 per pound, and No. 4, 37 cents per pound.

Mr. Dickinson—“In the quantity before supposed to be the average consumed, [35,000 pounds,] the qualities would be about the following, viz:

- 3000 pounds of common native wool,
- 8000 pounds of common and half Merino,
- 12000 pounds of three-fourths and seven-eighths Merino,
- 15000 pounds of full-blooded Merino.

“These aggregate amounts are greater than the proposed average; but the proportions I believe to be about correct.”

Mr. Dickinson purchased no foreign wool, and he gives the prices he has paid for American wool in 1825, at from 30 to 125 cents per

pound; in 1826, from 30 to 125 cents per pound; and in 1827, from 20 to 85 cents per pound.

Mr. Dickinson further says—"During these years we have been in the habit of manufacturing the finer qualities of the wool, and of marketing the coarse qualities in the eastern markets."

Mr. Schenck—The quality of the wool we use is purchased as full-blooded merino, and for which we pay an average price of 40 cents per pound.

Mr. Wolcott—In 1825, wool cost us higher than stated in my answer to the last question, (an average of $48\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound,) but I cannot give the rate with accuracy. In 1827, commencing in July, better wool than we gave 45 cts. for in 1826, was purchased by us at 40 cents. The same quality of wool is now worth, in the Boston market, at least fifty cents per pound.

Mr. Brown—We consumed wool varying in price from $37\frac{1}{2}$ cents to \$1 65 cents; about three-fourths of the whole we used was of American growth, and varied from $37\frac{1}{2}$ to 60 cents. The foreign wool cost us from 60 cts. to \$1 65 cents.

Mr. Clapp—In the first year we paid, on the average, about 62 cents for the foreign wool, and about 50 cents for the American. In the second year the foreign wool averaged 50 cents, and the domestic 34 cents.

Mr. Dupont—The most of the wool we have used, has been the native wool of this country, and the residue coarse Smyrna and South American wool. In 1825, we paid about 35 cents for pulled wool, which we mostly used. In 1826, I cannot say what price we paid. In 1827, we paid for the same kind of wool from about 25 to 30 cents per pound. I think the price has gradually fallen, from 1825 to this time. I think we have paid from 16 to 22 cents for the Smyrna wool, and about the same for the South American wool.

Mr. Pierce—We have for the three last years purchased and used a variety of qualities of wool, and our extremes in price, in 1825, were from 90 cents to 22 cents per pound for foreign wool, as nearly as my memory will enable me to speak. In this year our fine wool was Spanish, and the coarse was, I think, Adrianople. We paid this year for our domestic wool, from 25 to $62\frac{1}{2}$ cents per lb. according to my recollection. In 1826, we paid from $12\frac{1}{2}$ to 96 cents for our foreign wool. The fine this year was Saxony, and the coarse Portuguese. For our domestic, this year, we paid from 20 to 25 cents per lb. The domestic wool which we purchased this year at 55 cents, was better than that we purchased the preceding year at $62\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound. In 1827, we paid for our foreign wools from 61 to 74 cents per lb. ; it being all fine Saxony wool. For our domestic wool this year, we paid from 17 to 45 cents per lb.

Thus, Sir, from this reference to the testimony of the thirteen witnesses examined, it will be found that, at most, but three of them make any considerable use of coarse wools of any kind, and of these three, one (Mr. Marland) is a manufacturer of flannels exclusively. The demand for coarse wools, then, by the manufactories of the country, must

be proportionably limited. Two and one half millions of lbs. or about that amount, was the quantity imported during the last year; and this would seem to form most of that description of wool consumed by the manufacturing establishments. Can there then be a doubt that, from the coarse wool grown in the country, and from the quantities which must be obtained in assorting all wools for manufacture, this quantity, and a much larger than this, can, and will be supplied? These importations then, as I have before remarked, supply the market, which the native wool of the country ought to supply. Such were the opinions by which, as a member of the Committee on Manufactures, I was influenced in agreeing to the proposed duty on the coarse wools. I did believe that the native wool of the country was wanting the market which the coarse imported wools supply; nor did I suppose the exclusion of this description of foreign wool could be the subject of just alarm, as I did not then, and do not now, doubt the ability of the country fully to supply its place.

What remedy, then, does the amendment, proposed by the Hon. Chairman, provide against the importation of these coarse wools? It proposes to alter the valuation at which they shall be admitted from 10 to 8 cents. Beyond that it proposes no remedy. At and under 8 cents per pound they are still to be admitted at the nominal duty of 15 per cent. ad valorem. Let me ask, Mr. Chairman, if this proposition of the Hon. Chairman does not fall under the condemnation of his own argument in relation to another branch of this subject? We have been told by him, and we have been told by all the witnesses, that the present manner of levying the duty upon woollen goods is defective; that an ad valorem duty upon these goods can never furnish adequate protection; that the difficulty of correctly distinguishing the true quality, and consequently the true value of cloths, is insurmountable; that false invoices are and will be made; that the qualities of goods will be disguised; and that, under such a law, they will not pay their just rates of duty. This reasoning, Sir, had a convincing effect upon my mind. It had upon the minds of the Committee, as the bill they have reported will show. But if the doctrine is true as to *woollens*, is it not equally true as to *wool*? May not the quality of the one be as easily ascertained as that of the other? Will the Hon. Chairman pretend that the appraiser can distinguish the difference in quality between a pound of wool, the true cost of which, in a foreign market, has been or should be, 8 or 10 cents, so as to determine whether it should or should not be admitted under the nominal duty? Will he pretend that two cents in the foreign value of a pound of wool, furnish a more obvious distinction in the quality of the wool, than usually exists between pieces of cloth of different qualities? He will probably answer me that any frauds which may be practised under this provision are too trifling to be the subjects of serious apprehension. In this opinion I would readily agree with him, if they related to the importation of an article which the country does not produce. But I believe the fact to be otherwise; and if it be so, I am bound to suppose this difference of valuation will be of no utility. If the reasoning in relation to the frauds be sound as to the cloths, it must also be

sound as to the wool, and the alteration requisite to guard against them is not produced by the change of valuation from 10 to 8 cents. No remedy can be effective but a specific duty upon each pound of this wool. Any reasonable increase of the ad valorem duty upon an article of so small a value cannot operate as a sufficient guard, without being entirely disproportionate upon the finer wools: And, even laying aside that difficulty, the impossibility of distinguishing accurately the qualities of these wools, in the state they now are and will be imported, is not obviated by any ad valorem increase, and such a provision in relation to them would be left subject to all the objections made against it when applied to cloths. I have endeavored to show that these frauds do, to some extent, now exist. Indeed, the honorable Chairman admits their existence in some degree.

To what degree, then, will they not prevail, when the great additional inducement to commit them shall be offered, which the proposed amendment will offer? Pass that, and the question will not be whether the pound of wool costing abroad 10 cents, shall pay a duty of 15 or 30 per cent.; whether it shall pay $1\frac{1}{2}$ or 3 cents; but, whether it shall pay $1\frac{1}{2}$ or 20 cents; whether it shall pay 15 per cent. or 200 per cent. This, Sir, will then be the difference of a proper or improper valuation, and this the inducement to frauds in the importation of coarse wools.

I will trouble the Committee, Mr. Chairman, with one further reference to the testimony on the subject of the bill and amendment, so far as they relate to the wool, and I will tax their patience no farther upon this part of the subject. It will be found by an examination of this testimony, that nearly all the wool now imported, is either that invoiced at and below 10 cents per pound, or the fine Saxony and Spanish wools. This will be seen by the following testimony:

Aaron Tufts—Question. What are the usual qualities of wool imported?

Answer. Various qualities are imported. Some has been sold in Boston as low as six cents per pound, and from that to the finest Saxony wool, which has sold as high as one dollar sixty cents. Considerable quantities of the intermediate grades are also imported. *The largest quantity* imported, sells from 10 to 16 cents per pound in Boston.

Mr. Shepherd—Question. What are the usual qualities of wool imported?

Answer. Of late, the importations have been more of the coarsest quality than any other. The coarse wools are for carpet work, negro cloths, &c. Fine wools are also imported from Germany and Spain; middlings are from Portugal, the Netherlands, Russia, and South America. I bought at the auction sales this fall a quantity of coarse Russia wool at 13 cents per pound, and would sell it at the same price.

By reference to the testimony of Mr. Young, it will be found that the price paid at his factory for foreign wool, in 1825, was from 16 to 20 cents. In 1826, for Saxony wool, an average of \$1 05; for Spanish R. wool, an average of 66½ cents. In 1827, for Spanish R. wool, an average of 57½ cents; for Portugal R. wool, 31½ cents.

By reference to the testimony of Mr. Schenck, it will be found that all the foreign wool used at his factory last year, was of the coarse kind, and cost from eight to twelve cents; and that, during the last fall, they purchased in the New York market a lot of thirty bales of Spanish wool, for which they paid 72 cents per pound.

Mr. Brown—Question. What are the usual qualities of the wool imported?

Answer. *Coarse and fine wools* are imported principally. The coarse wools are worth from 10 to 15 cents. In the Boston market, the usual prices of the fine wool are from 60 to \$1 65.

Mr. Clapp—Question. What kinds of wool are imported, and from what places?

Answer. Almost every kind of wool is imported. Very coarse wools are received from South America and Smyrna, *and these form the largest proportion*. Fine wools are brought from Germany, Spain, and England. I cannot speak distinctly of the different proportions.

Mr. Poor—Question. Are you engaged in the importation of foreign wool and woollen goods? If so, from what places?

Answer. We have been engaged in the importation of foreign wool from Germany. We have not imported any from any other place.

By reference to the testimony of Mr. Pierce, it will be found that the prices paid at his factory for foreign wool, in 1825, were 90 cents and 22 cents, the fine wool being Spanish, and the coarse Adrianople. In 1826, for foreign wool, from 12½ cents to 96 cents, the fine being Saxony, and the coarse Portuguese. In 1827, for foreign wool, from 61 to 74 cents, it being all fine Saxony wool.

Thus, Sir, it will be seen, both from the direct answers of those witnesses, who were possessed of the information, as to the qualities of wool imported, and from the prices paid at the factories for foreign wools, that nearly the whole present importations are of the coarse or of the finer wools. This, too, is strongly to be inferred from the change of importations since the passage of the tariff of 1824. To this change I have already referred in the table of importations, and also in the tabular calculation with which I have already troubled the Committee; and I will not repeat it, any further than to remark that the value of the coarse wool imported, has increased from 1825 to 1827, from \$ 53,550 to \$ 174,788, while the value of the importations of all finer wools has diminished within the same period, from \$ 519,926, to \$ 233,739. Supposing the average cost abroad of the wool invoiced at and below 10 cents per pound, to be 7 cents per pound, the number of pounds imported in 1825, would have been 765,000, while the number of pounds imported in 1827, would have been 2,496,971, more than three times the quantity of the former year; and supposing the average cost, in the foreign market, of the fine wools imported, to be 50 cents per pound, the number of pounds imported in 1825, would have been 1,031,852, while the number of pounds imported in 1827, will have been only 467,478: considerably less than half the quantity for 1825.

Mr. Chairman, in addressing the Committee on Thursday, I assumed as the basis of my argument, that it could not be the policy of this government to encourage the introduction of any foreign raw material for the purpose of manufacture, when that same raw material is and can be produced in the country in sufficient quantities to answer any demand for it.

I then attempted to show, both from the testimony taken before the Committee on Manufactures, and from data which I gave to the Committee, that the United States do now, and will in all future time, produce wool enough to answer any demand of the manufacture of that article in the country. I then admitted, as I do now admit, that the data from which my calculations are made are subject to great uncertainty; but I still contend, that, with every allowance for this uncertainty, there cannot be a doubt of the ability of the country to furnish a full supply of wool.

I next gave the importations of foreign wool into the United States for several years last past, and urged, as a reason for my belief, that the imported coarse wools do conflict with the domestic wool, that very little or no common native wool of the country is purchased by the factories upon the sea-board, where the coarse imported wools are readily obtained, while the factories in the interior, employed in making the same description of cloth, use the domestic coarse wools for the same purposes for which the former use the imported.

I also urged, as a reason for an increase of duty upon the coarse wools particularly, that some of the importations of wool, under the existing law, were made in evasion of the spirit of that law; that much of the wool imported, invoiced at and under ten cents per pound, was imported entirely uncleansed, and in a very foul state, by which its quality was disguised; and that thus a quality of wool was in fact imported under that provision, better than was intended by the law, and which must necessarily conflict with a better quality of wool of our own country; and I gave, as evidence of the correctness of this position, statements of the relative decrease in the importations of fine, and increase in the importations of coarse wool, since that law has been in operation.

I next attempted to show that the native wools of this country might be used to answer the purposes for which the coarse imported wools are used; and I referred, in proof of this position, to the now prices of the native wools, and of the coarse foreign wools, in our own markets, as shown by the testimony taken before the Committee on Manufactures; to the fact, that none of the native wool was purchased by the factories located near the markets where the coarse imported wools are readily obtained, and that consequently there is little demand for it, while the foreign sells readily; and to the further fact, that the factories in the interior do use the native wools for the same purposes for which the foreign coarse wools are used. I also urged that in assorting wools for manufacture, qualities of coarse wool would be obtained similar to the qualities of the coarse imported wools.

Another ground upon which I advocated the propriety of an in-

increased duty upon the coarse wool was, that almost all the factories are now employed in the manufacture of fine wool; and that, therefore, an exclusion of the coarse foreign wool, if that should be the effect of the increased duty, would be less seriously felt by the manufacturers: in proof of which position I also referred to the testimony.

I then contended, that no other alteration of the existing law, than that of laying a specific duty upon every pound of this coarse wool, could reach the evil, and I used the same arguments in defence of the position which the manufacturers apply to cloth—that the qualities of the wool, differing so little in price, cannot be distinguished, and that the true quality may be disguised for the purpose of importation.

I next attempted to establish the fact that the present importations of wool are, nearly all, invoiced at and below ten cents per pound, or fine wool costing fifty cents and over, in our markets; and for this purpose I also had reference to the testimony in relation to the qualities of wool imported, and to the prices paid for imported wools by the manufacturers. It only remains for me, Mr. Chairman, to compare the duties on wool, as imposed by the existing law, with those proposed by the bill reported by the Committee on Manufactures, and also by the amendment of the honorable Chairman of that Committee. To do this, I have prepared a tabular calculation of the duties, according to the three several rates, setting each in a column by itself, in such a manner that the comparison may readily be made. In making this table I have assumed certain prices as the invoice value of each pound of wool, and to arrive at the correct ad valorem duty in each case, I have added ten per cent. to the supposed invoice value, as directed by the law, but have made no addition to the assumed invoice value for charges before the addition of the ten per cent. This, I believe, should be done to make the table technically correct; but the difference upon a single pound of wool would be very trifling, and I had no means of ascertaining what that addition should be. I am now told by a gentleman near me, that it should be $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. upon the invoice value, and another gentleman says it is $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. upon merchandise generally. I do not know, Sir, what it is, but I have made no allowance at all for it, nor is it material to my purpose that I should have done so. I feel sure the table will be found correct, with that single trifling exception. It is as follows:

TABLE.

Assumed invoice values of one pound of foreign imported wool.	Duty by the present law, with the addition of 10 per cent. to the assumed invoice value.	Duty which will be impos'd by the bill report. by the Com. on Manufac. specific & ad val.	Duty which will be impos'd by Mr. Mallary's amend. offered to the bill reported by the Committee.
On 1 lb. wool, costing in foreign market 4 cts.	Cts. Frac. .66	Cts. Frac. 8.76	Cts. Frac. .66
Do do do 5 cts.	.825	9.2	.825
Do do do 6 cts.	.99	9.64	.99
Do do do 7 cts.	1.155	10.08	1.155
Do do do 8 cts.	1.32	10.52	1.32
Do do do 9 cts.	1.485	10.96	20.
Do do do 45 cts.	14.85	26.8	20.
Do do do 50 cts.	16.5	29.	20.
Do do do 55 cts.	18.15	31.2	20.
Do do do 60 cts.	19.8	33.4	20.
Do do do 65 cts.	21.45	35.6	20.
Do do do 70 cts.	23.1	37.8	20.
Do do do 75 cts.	24.75	40.	20.
Do do do 80 cts.	26.4	42.2	20.
Do do do 85 cts.	28.05	44.4	20.
Do do do 90 cts.	29.7	46.6	20.
Do do do 95 cts.	31.35	48.8	20.
Do do do 100 cts.	33.	51.	20.

This comparison shows that the duty upon a pound of foreign wool costing abroad four cents, will, by the existing law, and by the amendment of the honorable Chairman, (for they are the same upon the low wools,) be 66-100 of one cent only, while the duty proposed by the Committee will be 8 76-100 cents upon the same pound of wool. The duty upon the pound of wool, costing abroad 8 cents, will, by the present law, and the proposed amendment, be 1 32-100 cents; and the duty proposed by the Committee upon the same pound of wool will be 10 52-100 cents. The highest duty, therefore, which will be charged upon any pound of wool proposed to be admitted at a duty of 15 per cent. ad valorem, if the amendment is adopted, will be 1 32-100 cents—a duty, as will readily be seen, merely nominal as relates to a check upon those importations. But take the next step of the comparison. A pound of wool, costing abroad 9 cents, pays, under the present law, a duty of 1 485-1000 cents; it will pay, if the bill reported by the Committee is adopted, 10 96-100 cents; and, if the amendment of the gentleman from Vermont, (Mr. Mallary,) is adopted, 20 cents; nearly double the duty proposed by the Committee. From this point to about 50 cents, very little wool is now imported; and if either the proposition of the Committee or the proposed amendment be adopt-

ed, I have supposed none would be. I have not, therefore, compared the relative duties between those prices.

After 9 cents, therefore, as the assumed price of a pound of foreign wool, I have taken 45 cents, and from that to one dollar I have compared at every five cents' increase of the invoice value. The comparison will be found to show that, after you pass the point of 60 cents as the invoice value of a pound of foreign wool, the proposed amendment of the honorable Chairman, (Mr. Mallary,) will operate as a rapid reduction of the present duty. This reduction, at 65 cents, will be 1 45-100 cents; and, at one dollar, 13 cents upon each pound of wool imported. This position must then be conceded as applicable to the amendment now under consideration, and which has been advocated by the honorable Chairman, (Mr. Mallary): 1st, *that it does not alter the present duty* upon wool costing 8 cents and under in the foreign market; and 2d, *that it does operate as a reduction of the present duty* upon wool costing more than 60 cents per pound in a foreign market.

But, Sir, I have made a calculation of this reduction upon wool actually proved to have been imported within the last three years, for the purpose of testing the practical effect of adopting this amendment, so far as relates to the fine imported wools. The calculation is made upon the basis of a reduction of one-third of the value here, as the difference between the cost abroad and the selling price in this country. The results are as follows:

Names of witnesses—Page of testimony referred to.	Selling prices in the U. States.	One 3d deducted for difference.	Foreign cost of same wool.
A. Tuffts, page 43,	\$1 60	\$ 54	\$1 06
W. Young, p. 55,	1 05	35	70
J. B. Brown, p. 65,	1 65	55	1 10
J. W. Pierce, p. 71,	96	32	64
	Duty by the present law at 30 per cent.	Duty by Mr. Mallary's amendment.	Reduction of duty by amendment.
A. Tuffts, p. 43,	34 98-100 cts.	20 cts.	14 98-100 cts.
W. Young, p. 55,	23 1-10 cts.	20 cts.	3 1-10 cts.
J. B. Brown, p. 65,	36 3-10 cts.	20 cts.	16 3-10 cts.
J. W. Pierce, p. 71,	21 12-100 cts.	20 cts.	1 12-100 cts.

Here then is a practical reduction, upon wool proved to have been imported, of from 1 12-100 to 16 3-10 cents per pound, in the highest instance amounting to a reduction of almost half the present duty upon wool of this quality. Now, Sir, I ask, are the Committee ready to adopt a provision which not only does not provide against the importa-

tions of coarse wools, but which does and will operate as an actual reduction of the present duty upon fine wools?

Again, Mr. Chairman, are we not told, that, pass what law you will in relation to cloths, the foreigner will accommodate himself, in his importations, to it? If this be true as to cloths, will it not be equally true as to wool? Will not the importations of wool be equally accommodated to your regulations of the duty? Pass this amendment, then, Sir, and all that is required is, that the foreigner should send his wool assorted. That is now the practice with many of the finer wools, as has been seen from the testimony; but pass this amendment, and the inducement to adopt this practice will be direct and strong. Then you will find assorted wool imported, coming in direct competition with your own finest wool assorted; and that, too, while the finest qualities thus produced will only be subject to a duty of 20 cents per pound: and the above reference to the testimony shows that some of this wool, now imported, sells in our market as high as \$1 65 per pound. I again ask, then, Sir, will the Committee adopt a provision, the effect of which will be to repeal the duty already imposed upon foreign wool? Will they not only admit the coarse wool under a mere nominal duty, but reduce the duty one half upon fine wool, and call this protection to domestic wool?

But, Sir, I have done with the subject of the bill and amendment, so far as they relate to the raw wool, and now pass to the woollen cloths, and to a comparison of the bill reported by the Committee with the present law, and also with the proposed amendment, as they relate to the duty upon the manufactured fabrics. And here, Mr. Chairman, it becomes my duty to remark, that, at an early period of the labors of the Committee on Manufactures, I found I could not act with certainty upon this subject, with the information then possessed. I could not obtain the means of determining what protection the manufacturers required, and therefore it was that I wished for an examination of witnesses before the Committee. The power was granted by the House, and the Committee have examined the manufacturers themselves. It shall now be my object to ascertain what facts have been established, by the testimony so taken, which will enable us to arrive, with some degree of certainty, at the just measure of this protection. And here, Sir, I can only promise the Committee that my references to the evidence shall not be as tedious as those I have formerly made. The testimony upon the points to which I shall now ask the attention of the Committee, is much more precise and satisfactory, than upon many other positions before taken.

I then assume, as a fact well settled by the evidence, that the cost of the wool, and the cost of manufacturing it into cloth ready for the market, as a general rule in this country, at the present prices of wool, are about equal; or, in other words, that the cost of the raw wool in the United States, is about one half the cost of the cloth it makes.

For the proof of this proposition, I refer to the following testimony:
Aaron Tufts—Ques. What proportion in cash does raw wool bear to the present price of the fabric, estimating that cost at 35 cents per pound?

Ans. My opinion is about one half.

James Shepherd—Ques. What proportion does raw wool bear to the present price of the fabric, estimating that fabric at \$ 1 per yard?

Ans. Wool costing from 20 to 75 cents, is half the price of the fabric. Where it costs more than 75 cents, the price of labor does not increase, and the value of the fabric is increased in proportion to the price of the wool.

William Phillips—Ques. What proportion in cash does raw wool bear to the present price of the fabric?

Ans. It costs something less than the expense of manufacturing it.

Abraham Marland—Ques. What proportion in cash does raw wool bear to the present price of the fabric?

Ans. In the coarse goods I make, the cost of the wool is about one half the cost of the fabric; in the finer fabrics, it is not quite so much.

William W. Young—Ques. What proportion in cash does the present cost of wool bear to the present cost of the fabric, as manufactured at your factory.

Ans. The calculation is, that cassimeres, of all colors, except blue, must bring double the price of the raw material to secure the manufacturer against loss; blues must bring from twenty-five to thirty-five cents, according to the price of indigo, the yard, more than double the raw material, to prevent loss.

William R. Dickinson—Ques. What proportion in cash does the present cost of wool bear to the present cost of the fabric, as manufactured at your factory?

Ans. I am not myself a practical manufacturer, but am familiarly conversant with the details of the business; from that acquaintance, and from the best of my judgment, I would estimate the cost of the wool to be one half of the cost of the common and middling qualities of cloths, when prepared for the market, and as you go to the finer cloths, the proportionate cost of the wool increases.

Joshua Clapp—Ques. What proportion in cash does the present cost of wool bear to the present cost of fabrics made at your factory?

Ans. I think the cost of the wool constitutes about one half the cost of the cloth.

Joshua W. Pierce—Ques. What proportion does the present cost of wool bear to the present cost of the cloth or fabric, as a general average?

Ans. My judgment would be, that on the bulk of cloths, similar to those we make, the cost of the wool would be about one half the cost of the cloth when finished.

This, Mr. Chairman, closes the testimony as to this proposition, and upon which point every witness, whose knowledge of practical manufacturing has enabled him to answer the question, has given the same answer very nearly. I therefore consider the proposition as fully and incontrovertibly established by the proof. It will be found, however, that while this position is true as a general rule, there will be variations in it according to the different qualities of the cloth made. The cost of manufacturing the finer qualities, will be less than the cost of the wool, and the cost of the manufacturing the coarse qualities, will

be greater than the cost of the wool, while at some of the intermediate qualities, an almost exact equality will exist.

In lots of wool costing not more than 75 cents per pound, these variations will balance each other, and form an average equality between the cost of the wool and the cost of manufacturing, in any given quantity of wool.

In proof of this, I offer a statement very generously furnished to me by an intelligent gentleman interested in the Steubenville factory, Ohio. The statement is in a tabular form, and embraces, in each column, the value of a pound of wool of each quality, and the value in separate items of manufacturing each pound of each quality of the wool as assorted, the wool before assortment being worth 75 cents per pound. The table and results are as follows:

A statement showing the manner in which the cost of cloths is made out at the woollen manufactory of B. Wells & Co. Steubenville, Ohio.*

	P. L.	P.	No. 1.	No. 2.	No. 3.	No. 4.	No. 5.
Wool, 75 cts. - \$	2 10	1 50	1 13	68	56	45	38
Dying indigo blue -	30	30	26	23	23	22	22
Carding, slubbing, & oil	10	10	9	8	6	5	5
Spinning - - -	9	9	7	7	6	6	5
Weaving - - -	16	16	15	15	12	12	12
Warping, lists, headings, sizing, looming, pick- ing, &c. &c. - -	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
Scouring, fulling, and soap - - -	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Napping - - -	5	5	5	5	4	4	4
Shearing - - -	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Picking, lettering, steam brushing, pressing, &c.	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Repairs, wear and tear of machinery, coal, engineer's wages, &c. &c. - - -	31	25	20	16	13	11	10
Total cost when finished	3 34	2 68	2 18	1 65	1 43	1 28	1 19
Length when finsh'd yds.	47	47	47	49	50	50	51
Cost pr. yd. when finsh'd	7 10	5 70	4 63	3 37	2 86	2 56	2 34

* Average for 1825, 1826, and 1827, of *Indigo blue*. I have already stated that we are now manufacturing (because of our improved machinery and retrenchment,) upon better terms.

A recapitulation of the above table, will show the cost of the wool, and of manufacturing it, of each quality, and the difference in the cost of manufacturing all the qualities taken together over the cost of the wool.

Cost of the wool of each quality—P. L. \$2 10; P. 1 50; No. 1, 1 13; No. 2, 68 cts.; No. 3, 56; No. 4, 45; No. 5, 38—Total, 680.

Cost of manufacturing each quality—P. L. \$1 24; P. 1 18; No. 1, 1 05; No. 2, 97 cts.; No. 3, 87; No. 4, 83; No. 5, 81—Total, 695—Difference 15.

An examination of this recapitulation will show that the manufacturing the first or finest quality of wool, is almost half less than the cost of the wool; that at the third quality, or number one, the cost of the wool and the cost of manufacturing are very nearly equal, and that at the lowest quality, the cost of manufacturing is a trifle more than double the cost of the wool, while, upon the sum total of all the qualities, the difference of the manufacturing over the cost of the wool is only 15 cents. This practical table, therefore, while it shows the variations to which I have referred, fully supports the correctness of the proposition as a general rule, that the cost of wool and the cost of manufacturing it into cloth ready for the market, are about equal. It should also be particularly remarked, that this table and the items of cost given, are for indigo blue cloths, the most expensive in the manufacture.

The next principle which I consider as established by the testimony is, that any given parcel of wool can be manufactured into cloth as cheap in the United States as it can in England; or, in other words, that the difference between the cost of woollen cloths in the United States and in England, is the difference in the cost of wool, the expense of manufacturing being the same in both countries.

For the proof of this position, I must also refer to the testimony of the following witnesses:

Mr. Shepherd—Question. Of an equal quality of wool, at present prices, in England and the United States, can the English manufacturer make a cheaper fabric than can be made in the United States? If so, how much cheaper?

Answer. The difference in the price of the fabric would be *the difference in the price of wool*, in my opinion, as I think we can manufacture it as cheap as they can.

Mr. Marland—Question. If wool be the same price here and in England, can the American manufacturer make the fabric as cheap as it is made in England?

Answer. I think we can manufacture wool in this country about as cheap as they can in England, wool being at the same price.

Mr. Young—Question. Is labor as cheap here as in England? and can the fabric be manufactured here as cheap as there, except as to the cost of the wool?

Answer. I think it can. I believe if I can have the raw material at the same price, I can manufacture cassimere as cheap as it can be done in England.

Mr. Wolcott—Question. Of an equal quality of wool, at present prices, in England and the United States, can the English manufacturer make a cheaper fabric than can be made in the United States?

Answer. We can do the mere labor of the manufacture as cheap as it is done in England.

Mr. Clapp—Question. What is the difference in the price of labor in the manufacture of broad cloths, between Great Britain and this country?

Answer. As far as it regards labor, I believe we can manufacture wool as cheap in the United States as in Great Britain.

Mr. Dupont—Question. Without reference to the difference in the price of wool, can the fabric be manufactured as cheap in the United States as in England?

Answer. The woollen manufactory is not yet fairly established in this country; but I know no reason why we cannot manufacture as well, and as cheap, as they can in England, except the difference in the price of labor, for which, in my opinion, we are fully compensated by other advantages. Our difficulties are not the cost of manufacturing, but the great fluctuations in our home market, caused by the excessive and irregular foreign importations. The high prices we pay for labor are, in my opinion, beneficial to the American manufacturer, as for those wages he gets a much better selection of hands, and those capable of, and willing to perform a much greater amount of labor in a given time. The American manufacturer also uses a larger share of labor-saving-machinery than is used in the English manufactories, which very much diminishes the effect of the higher rate of wages upon the actual cost of our goods.

Mr. Pierce—Quest. Without reference to the price of wool, can the fabric be manufactured as cheap in the United States as in England?

Ans. I think it can. All my information brings me to this conclusion, and one reason I would assign, is, that we substitute a much larger share of the labor of females, than they do in England in the woollen manufacture.

Here, again, Mr. Chairman, there is an entire agreement among all the witnesses who are able to answer the interrogatory of the Committee, in relation to the position I have taken, and their answers all go to establish its correctness.

I next assume it to be proved by the evidence taken, that the cost of wool in this country is greater than the cost of the same wool in England by from 50 to 80 per cent. upon the English cost; or, in other words, wool of the same quality costs from one-third to four-fifths more in the United States than it does in England.

Here, again, Sir, I must tax the Committee with a reference to the swearing of the witnesses, and I can only cheer them with the assurance that it is the last which I propose to make.

The following question, in substance, was put to most, if not all of the witnesses examined before the Committee upon the subject of wool

and woollens, and I will give the answers of such of them as were able to give definite answers to it.

Mr. Tufts—Quest. Do you know the difference in the price of wool of the same quality in the British and in the American markets?

Ans. I am not an importer, and therefore derive my information from those who are, and I have often understood from them, that the prices are from 60 to 70 per centum higher in this country than in Europe, of wool costing over ten cents per pound in Europe. *This would not apply to the wool under ten cents.*

Mr. Shepherd—Ans. If wool be sold here, it commands 50 per cent. in addition to its price in England, and this is the lowest price at which it can be sold to cover all expenses. Some sales have been made here at a higher price. I cannot say what is the comparative price of American wool to an American manufacturer, compared with the price which an English manufacturer would have to pay for it there, because the wool, manufactured by them severally, is never the same.

Mr. Young—Ans. The difference in price is from sixty to seventy per cent.

Mr. Schenck—Ans. The only information I have is the fact, that in October last, we purchased in the New York market, thirty bales of Spanish wool, at 75 cents per pound, which cost in London, in the preceding August, 2s. 1d. sterling, or 46 cents per pound; making a difference of 26 cents per pound upon the very same wool.

Mr. Brown—Ans. I have not been concerned in any importations myself, but I believe the general difference is about 60 per cent between the cost in England and the sale price in the Boston market.

Mr. Clapp—Ans. I think wool of the same quality is from 60 to 75 per cent. higher in America than in England.

Mr. Poor—Ans. It has, in my opinion, been from 70 to 80 per cent. higher in the American market than in Europe, during the past year.

Mr. Peirce—Ans. I do not know except from information; but from information upon which I can rely, I believe the difference of price to be about one half. As part of this information, I refer to facts detailed in papers now in the possession of Benjamin Poor, a witness now before the committee.

These answers give as the extremes of difference in the price of wool in the two countries, 50 and 80 per cent. upon the English price; and one witness says, "this (50 per cent.) is the lowest price at which it can be sold to cover all expenses;" thus plainly giving us to understand that this will cover all expenses, and leaving the equally plain inference that any further advance is the importer's profit, whatever that advance may be. In corroboration of this idea, also, the witness, Mr. Poor, is asked—"Is importing wool a profitable business, and do the importers find ready sales for it?" And his answer is, "It has been a profitable business for some time past, say at least for 1827; but it is attended with uncertainty, like other mercantile pursuits. During the past year the sales have been very ready: we have

sold, as auctioneers, about 360,000 pounds of foreign wool, and about 108,000 pounds of domestic wool." Yet, Sir, as the witnesses do not exactly agree as to this difference in the prices of wool between England and this country, and as I wish to put this subject upon at least a safe footing, for the American manufacturer, I have assumed the medium between these two extremes of 50 and 80 per cent. to be the correct difference between the price of wool in the two countries, and shall make my estimates upon a supposed difference in the cost of wool in favor of England, of 65 per cent. which is that medium.

Before I proceed, however, to examine the question whether the duties proposed by the bill, as reported by the Committee on Manufactures, do furnish sufficient protection to the American manufacturer, I will see what those duties are, upon what they are to operate, and compare them with the duties imposed by the present law, and with those proposed by the amendment of the honorable Chairman. (Mr. Mallary.)

The items as found in the executive tables of imports, upon which the proposed amendment, and consequently the corresponding provisions of the bill, are to operate, are three; cloths and cassimeres exceeding $33\frac{1}{3}$ cents the square yard; cloths and cassimeres not exceeding $33\frac{1}{3}$ cents the square yard; and all other manufactures paying a duty of $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. I have prepared a table of the imports of these items for several years past, and will now give the amounts to the committee, including the first and last items mentioned in one amount, as those items now pay the same duty. The importations for the three last years have been as follows:

1825.—The value imported paying a duty of					
	$33\frac{1}{3}$	per cent. was	-	-	-
Do	25	do	-	-	-
					\$7,196,858
					141,585

Total for 1825,	\$7,338,443
-----------------	-------------

1826.—The value imported, paying a duty of					
	$33\frac{1}{3}$	per cent. was	-	-	-
Do	25	do	-	-	-
					\$5,913,039
					112,344

Total for 1826,	\$6,025,883
-----------------	-------------

1827.—The value imported, paying a duty of					
	$33\frac{1}{3}$	per cent. was	-	-	-
Do	25	do	-	-	-
					\$5,527,567
					251,175

Total for 1827,	\$5,778,742
-----------------	-------------

The other woollen goods affected by the bill, as reported by the committee, are woollen blankets, hosiery, mits, gloves and bindings. Of these the importations for the last three years have been as follows:

1825.—Blankets, paying a duty of 25 per cent.	-	\$ 891,197
Hosiery, gloves, mits, &c. do 33½ do -	-	369,747
Total for 1825,		\$ 1,260,944
1826.—Blankets, paying a duty of 25 per cent.	-	\$ 527,784
Hosiery, gloves, mits, &c. do 33½ do -	-	189,993
Total for 1826,		\$ 717,777
1827.—Blankets, paying a duty of 25 per cent.	-	\$ 705,849
Hosiery, gloves, mits, &c. do 33½ do -	-	377,729
Total for 1827,		\$ 1,083,578

These last subjects, however, not being embraced in the proposed amendment of the honorable chairman, are not now the subjects of my consideration, and I only give them to enable the committee to take at one view, the whole amount of importations upon which the bill can operate, as well those embraced in the amendment as those which are not. From this view of the importations of the last three years, it will be seen that the whole amount of importations of woollen goods into the United States, upon which the amendment, or that part of the bill proposed to be amended, is to operate, varies very little from six millions of dollars, and is less for the last two, than for former years. This, then, shows us upon what the bill of the committee, or the proposed amendment, is to operate.

What, then, are the present and the proposed duties? The present duties upon these goods, as will be seen by the amount of importations just given, is 25 and 33½ per cent. ad valorem. The bill reported proposes a change in the manner of levying the duties from an ad valorem to a specific form, by adopting the minimum principle, as it is called, and thus recommends an increase of the present rates of duty in two ways: 1st, by a direct increase of the ad valorem duty; and 2d, by the regulation of the minimums; so that by the provisions of the bill a square yard of cloth, costing in a foreign market 20 cents, and one costing 50 cents, will pay the same duty; a square yard of cloth costing 51 cents, and one costing 100 cents, will pay the same duty; a square yard of cloth costing 101 cents, and one costing 250 cents, will pay the same duty; and a square yard of cloth costing 251 cents, and one costing 400 cents, will pay the same duty; and all intermediate values in each case will pay the same duty with the highest extreme of the minimum. All values above 4 dollars the square yard, are, by the bill, to pay an ad valorem duty of 45 per cent. The amendment of the honorable Chairman (Mr. Mallary) proposes to make a square yard of cloth, costing in a foreign market 20 cents, and one costing 50 cents, pay the same duty; a square yard of cloth costing 51 cents, and one costing 250 cents, pay the same duty; a square yard of cloth costing 250 cents, and one costing 400 cents, pay the same duty; and a square yard of cloth costing 401 cents, and one costing 600 cents, pay the same duty; and fixes upon the lower priced cloths a somewhat

higher rate of duty than that proposed by the bill, but a rate of duty not so high upon the fine cloths, it proposing 40, and the bill reported by the committee 45 per cent. I have prepared a table showing the duties which are imposed by the present law, and which will be imposed by either of these propositions, if adopted, as the only means of presenting the comparison in an intelligible form, and I find the result as follows:

	Duty fixed by the pre- sent law 25 and 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent.	Duty pro- pos'd by the bill report'd by com. on manufac's.	Duty pro- posed by amendment offered by Mr. Mallary to the bill.
<i>Assumed values square yard cloths.</i>	<i>Cts Frac</i>	<i>Dls. Cts.</i>	<i>Dls. Cts.</i>
1 sq. yd. cloth costing 20 cts. 25 per ct.	5.5	16	22
1 do 25 cents do	6.875	16	22
1 do 30 do do	8.25	16	22
1 do 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ do do	9.1675	16	22
1 do 35 do 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ do	12.833	16	22
1 do 40 do do	14.666	16	22
1 do 45 do do	16.5	16	22
1 do 50 do do	18.33	16	22
1 do 60 do do	22.	40	1 10
1 do 70 do do	25.666	40	1 10
1 do 80 do do	29.333	40	1 10
1 do 90 do do	33.	40	1 10
1 do 100 do do	36.666	40	1 10
1 do 120 do do	44.	1 00	1 10
1 do 140 do do	51.333	1 00	1 10
1 do 160 do do	58.666	1 00	1 10
1 do 180 do do	66.	1 00	1 10
1 do 200 do do	73.333	1 00	1 10
1 do 225 do do	82.5	1 00	1 10
1 do 250 do do	91.666	1 00	1 10
1 do 275 do do	100.833	1 76	1 76
1 do 300 do do	110.	1 76	1 76
1 do 325 do do	119.166	1 76	1 76
1 do 350 do do	128.333	1 76	1 76
1 do 375 do do	137.5	1 76	1 76
1 do 400 do do	146.666	1 76	1 76
1 do 450 do do	165.	2 22 $\frac{2}{3}$	2 64
1 do 500 do do	183.333	2 47 $\frac{1}{2}$	2 64
1 do 550 do do	201.666	2 72 $\frac{1}{4}$	2 64
1 do 600 do do	220.	2 97	2 64

This, Sir, is a detailed comparison of the duties, at a variety of stages, under the present law, and by the two propositions now upon your table. The ad valorem duties, in this comparison, are cast by

the addition of 10 per cent. to the assumed value of the cloth, without any previous addition for charges, which I am informed constitute a part of the dutiable value of the imports, and which, upon goods, are usually about $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The variation, however, upon a single yard of cloth, will be extremely small; and as all the duties in the comparison are cast by the same rule, the table will be proportionably accurate.

Another tabular calculation will show the rates per cent. of the duties proposed by the bill, and also by the amendment of the honorable Chairman, by which the direct increase of the rates proposed and also the increase produced by the adoption of the minimum principle, may be seen and compared. That this comparison may be as perfect as practicable, I have made the calculation at the extremes, and at the mean of each minimum, and have also given the medium increase of the present rates of duty upon each minimum, both of the bill and of the amendment. They are as follows:

	Present law rates per ct. of duty.	Comm. Bill, rate per cent. of duty proposed.	Mallory's amend't rates per cent. of duty as proposed.	Medium increase of rates of duty beyond present law.	
	25 p. ct.	80 per cent.	110 per cent.	By Bill.	Amendment.
<i>1st Minimum, same in bill and amendment.</i>					
Lowest extreme assumed to be 20 cents,					
Highest do. is 50 do.	33 $\frac{1}{3}$	32 do	44 do	12 pr. ct.	29 pr. ct.
Medium is 35 do.	33 $\frac{1}{3}$	45 do	62 do		
<i>2d Minimum of Bill.</i>					
Lowest extreme is 51 cents,	33 $\frac{1}{3}$	78 do	215 do		
Highest do. is 100 do.	33 $\frac{1}{3}$	40 do		20 do	
Medium is 75 do.	33 $\frac{1}{3}$	53 do			40 do
<i>3d Minimum of Bill.</i>					
Lowest extreme is 101 cents,	33 $\frac{1}{3}$	99 do			
Highest do. is 250 do.	33 $\frac{1}{3}$	40 do	44 per cent.	23 do	
Medium is 175 do.	33 $\frac{1}{3}$	57 do	73 do		
<i>4th Minimum of Bill—3d of Amendment.</i>					
Lowest extreme is 251 cents,	33 $\frac{1}{3}$	70 do	70 do		
Highest do. is 400 do.	33 $\frac{1}{3}$	44 do	44 do	20 do	20 do
Medium is 325 do.	33 $\frac{1}{3}$	54 do	54 do		
<i>4th Minimum of Amendment.</i>					
Lowest extreme is 401 cents,	33 $\frac{1}{3}$	This min. is not	65 do		
Highest do. is 600 do.	33 $\frac{1}{3}$	in the bill report-	44 do		19 do
Medium is 500 do.	33 $\frac{1}{3}$	ed by the Comm-	52 do		
The Bill, after 4 dollars,	33 $\frac{1}{3}$	45 per cent.		11 do	
The Amendment, after 6 dollars,	33 $\frac{1}{3}$		40 do		6 do

*2d min. of bill not contained in amendment. Medium of amendment will be \$1 50.

Thus it will be found that the rates of duty proposed by the Committee, range from 32 to 99 per cent. omitting fractions entirely, which are omitted in the table, and that the rates proposed by the amendment vary from 44 to 215 per cent. In one single instance the duty proposed by the Committee diminishes the present duty. That instance is at the very highest extreme of the first, or 50 cent minimum. The now rate of duty upon a square yard of cloth costing 50 cents in a foreign market, as will be seen by the table, is $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. while the rate proposed by the bill at that point, is but 32 per cent; or, to be better understood, as I intend to argue this question with perfect candour, the duty proposed by the Committee upon a yard of cloth invoiced at fifty cents, or at any price under that sum, is 16 cents; while the present duty upon a yard of cloth invoiced exactly at 50 cents, would be $18\frac{1}{3}$ cents, making a difference in favor of the present duty, confined strictly to this point, as to cost, of $2\frac{1}{3}$ cents. This, upon its face, and unexplained, would seem to be wrong, and contrary to the principles which have governed the Committee. I will, therefore, ask the patience of the Committee for one moment, while I examine this minimum. It is conceded on all hands that the cloths falling within this minimum, must be either very coarse fulled cloths, or the lighter fabrics, as baizes, flannels, &c. Now the first difficulty presenting itself in the formation of this bill, was to graduate a duty which should afford protection to the manufacturer upon these coarse fulled cloths, and at the same time should not be entirely unreasonable upon the light fabrics just mentioned. The present law had made a distinction in the duty below this point, of 50 cents, and had imposed a duty of only 25 per cent. upon all cloths costing $33\frac{1}{3}$ cents the square yard, while upon all costing over that sum, a duty of $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent was imposed. To this distinction flannels and baizes were made an exception, and the distinction was declaredly introduced to favor a description of the coarse fulled cloths, extensively used, and forming the heaviest item of woollens consumed in one section of this Union. I refer to the cloths commonly called negro cloths. These were supposed mostly to come under the distinction of cloths costing less than $33\frac{1}{3}$ cents the square yard, and therefore to pay a duty of 25 per cent. If this was a correct supposition of the former law, I ask, Mr. Chairman, what duty will these cloths pay by the proposed bill? A square yard of cloth costing $33\frac{1}{3}$ cents by the present law pays a duty of $9\frac{16}{100}$ cents, say $9\frac{2}{10}$ cents. By the bill reported by the Committee, the same yard of cloth will pay a duty of 16 cents, making an increase of the duty beyond what is now imposed, of $6\frac{8}{100}$ upon every square yard. Now, Sir, suppose no single yard of these cloths comes invoiced at a less price than $33\frac{1}{3}$ cents, I ask, is not this a sufficient increase of the duty? It is 48 instead of 25 per cent. But we have seen by the calculation and table I have just given, that the average increase of duty upon this minimum, even supposing 20 cents to be its lowest extreme, by the effect of the minimum principle, is 12 per cent. beyond the duty now imposed; and this is true, while at the extreme point of 50 cents, the present duty is very triflingly reduced. This is the only minimum

proposed in the bill where the present rate of duty is not increased even at the highest extreme of the graduated value. Thus, all cloths costing more than 50 cents, and not more than one dollar, are to pay the same duty, a duty of 40 cents upon every square yard. The present duty upon a yard of cloth costing 1 dollar, is $36\frac{2}{3}$ cents; thus leaving an increase at the very extreme of this minimum, of the difference between $36\frac{2}{3}$ and 40 cents, or $3\frac{1}{3}$ on the yard of cloth, while at the lowest extreme of this minimum, the difference between the present and the proposed duty, is a fraction more than 21 cents upon each yard of cloth, in favor of the latter. The average increase upon cloths falling within this minimum, is, as we have just seen, 20 per cent. beyond the present rate of duty.

I will not trouble the Committee with a further recapitulation of this table, than to remark, that an examination of the calculation will show that the medium increase of duty upon cloths falling within the third minimum, is 23 per cent. beyond the present duty, and within the fourth, a fraction more than 20 per cent. increase; while the extremes will be found equally to increase the present rates of duty upon the same cloths. After this point, I presume the bill will not be objected against by the friends of the amendment, as its proposed rates of duty are even higher than those proposed by the amendment. The medium increase beyond the present rate of duty, by the respective minimums, in the proposed amendment, will be found by this table to be, upon the first, 29 per cent.; upon the second, 40 per cent.; upon the third, 20 per cent.; and upon the fourth, 19 per cent., rejecting fractions, and the extremes of increase are from 10 to 182 per cent.

Thus, having seen what the present duty is, what the duties proposed by the bill and amendment are, and what increase beyond the present rate and amount, is proposed by each, it remains for me to examine whether the duties proposed by the bill, as reported by the Committee, are sufficient to give to the manufacturer of woollen cloths that protection which he actually requires. And here let me ask, Mr. Chairman, what protection does the manufacturer really need? Have we the means of answering this inquiry? I think, Sir, we have, and that too, with considerable certainty. I have already shown, or attempted to show, that the cost of wool, and the cost of manufacturing it into cloth, at the present prices of wool in this country, are equal; that any given parcel of wool can be manufactured into cloth as cheap in the United States as it can in England; or, in other words, that the difference in the cost of woollen cloths in the two countries, is the difference in the cost of the wool of which they are made, the expense of manufacturing being the same in both; and that the cost of wool in the United States is greater than the cost of the same wool in England, by from 50 to 80 per cent. upon the English cost. These propositions I consider to be fully proved by the testimony to which I have referred; and taking them to be true, I think we arrive necessarily at the conclusion, that the protection which the manufacturer of woollen goods in this country requires, is equal to the difference between the cost of the wool he uses in England and in this country. The cost of his fabric

is the cost of the wool and the cost of manufacturing it into the fabric; and, as it is established that the English and the American manufacturer can do the manufacturing at the same expense, the difference at which each can furnish the fabric at cost, must be the difference which each has to pay for the wool of which it is made. But it is also established that, as a general rule, the cost of the wool is one half of the cost of the fabric when prepared for the market, and that the cost of wool in this country is greater than the cost of the same, or an equal quality of wool in England, by from 50 to 80, the medium 65 per cent. upon the English cost. Therefore, the protection required by our manufacturers, is equal to 65 per cent. upon the cost in England of the wool they use. If, Sir, I am understood in this position—and the reasoning seems to me to be plain and palpable, and to follow irresistibly from the testimony, I will proceed to compare the duties proposed by the Committee, with this standard of required protection, by which I believe it will be found that these duties are, in all instances, more than sufficient. This comparison, I have also found it necessary to make in a tabular form to render it intelligible, and, tedious as I know it is to read figures, I will give it to the Committee.

	Cost of the cloth as assumed by the Committee.	Cost of the wool required, being half the cost of the cloth.	Cost of the same wool in England, as obtained from the testimony.	Difference between the cost of wool in England and U. S. or the pro- tection required.	Protection propos- ed by the bill re- ported by the Committee.	Excess of protec- tion proposed over that requir- ed.
<i>1st Minimum</i> —Lowest extreme, Highest do Medium,	Dolls. Cts. 20	Dolls. Cts. 10	Cts. fracs. 6.0606	Cts. fracs. 3.9394	Cts. fracs. 16	Cts. fracs. 12.0606
	50	25	15.1515	9.8485	16	6.1515
	35	17.5	10.6060	6.8939	16	9.1061
<i>2d Minimum</i> —Lowest extreme, Highest do Medium,	51	25.5	15.4545	10.0455	40	29.9545
	1 00	50	30.3030	19.6970	40	20.3030
	75	37.5	22.7272	14.7728	40	25.2272
<i>3d Minimum</i> —Lowest extreme, Highest do Medium,	1 01	50.5	30.6060	19.8940	100	80.1060
	2 50	1 25	75.7575	49.2425	100	50.7575
	1 75.5	87.75	53.1818	34.5682	100	65.4318
<i>4th Minimum</i> —Lowest extreme, Highest do Medium,	2 51	1 25.5	76.0606	49.4394	176	126.5606
	4 00	2 00	121.2121	78.7879	176	97.2121
	3 25.5	1 62.75	98.6363	64.1137	176	111.8863
After this the bill proposes an ad valorem duty of 45 per cent. Every dollar will then stand as follows:	1 00	50	30.3030	19.6970	49.5	29.8030

Thus it will be seen that the least proportionable protection offered, is upon the yard of cloth costing 50 cents, and that upon that yard of cloth the excess of the duty over and above the difference in the cost

of the wool, or the protection required, is, disregarding fractions, six cents; that at \$1, or the highest extreme of the second minimum, the excess of the duty over the protection required is 20 cents upon each yard of cloth; that at the highest extreme of the third minimum, \$2 50, the excess is 50 cents upon each yard of cloth; and that at \$4 00, or the highest extreme of the fourth minimum, the excess upon the square yard of cloth is 97 cents. These are the points where the proposed duty must afford the least protection, and the excess will necessarily increase in a direct ratio from these to the lowest points in each minimum, when it will be found to be from 12 to 126 cents upon a yard of cloth, while the medium excess of the proposed duty, beyond the difference in the cost of wool in England and this country, in each minimum, is, upon the first 9 cents; upon the second 25 cents; upon the third 65 cents; and upon the fourth 111 cents, upon every square yard of cloth falling within the limits of the minimum. This, however, will only be true upon the supposition that an equal number of yards of cloth will be imported of every value within those limits, which I do not pretend to believe will be the practical effect; but, Sir, I do believe that this effect will be experienced at every point where the duty does not amount to a total exclusion, and so far as it does, it will not surely be contended that the protection is not sufficient. I am willing, however, to put the trial upon the very highest extreme of each minimum, and there the duty will in every instance be found more than equal to the advantage possessed by the foreign manufacturer on account of the low price of his wool. What then, Sir, does the bill do for our own manufacturer? It does more than to place him on a par with the British manufacturer, (and he is the person with whom he has to contend,) without considering at all the cost, to the British manufacturer, of transporting his goods to our markets.

But, Sir, since I had prepared the table which I have just detailed to the Committee, I have been reminded, by the kindness of a friend, that these calculations were made upon the cost of cloths in this country, whereas the calculations should apply to cloths costing these sums per square yard in England. The distinction had not occurred to me; but, upon examination, I found the differences so considerable, that I have made a similar table upon that basis, and I will give those results also to the Committee. They are as follows:

	Cost per square yard of cloth in England at each extreme, and at the medium of each minimum.	Cost of manufacturing this cloth in England, being the same as it is in the United States.	Cost of the wool in England, being less than it is in the U. States by 65 per cent. on this cost.	Duty on English cloth, as proposed by the bill reported by the Committee.	Cost of English cloth in the United States, exclusive of all charges or profits, except duty.	Cost of manufacturing same cloth in the United States, being the same as it is in England.	English cost of wool, to which add next column to make cost of wool in the United States.	65 per cent. on cost of wool in England, the sum against which protection is required.	Total cost of same cloth made in the United States, being the addition of the three last columns.	Difference in favor of the American cloth in the American markets, exclusive of profits or charges on either, except duty on the English cloth.
1st Minimum.										
Lowest Extreme,	Dolls. Cts.	Cts. Frac.	Cts. Frac.	Dols. Cts.	Dols. Cts.	Cts. Frac.	Cts. Frac.	Cts. Frac.	Cts. Frac.	Cents. Frac.
Highest Do.	00 20	12 4528	7 5472	00 16	00 36	12 4528	7 5472	4 9056	24 9056	11 0944
Medium,	00 50	31 1321	18 8679	00 16	00 66	31 1321	18 8679	12 2642	62 2642	3 7358
	00 35	21 7924	13 2076	00 16	00 51	21 7924	13 2076	8 5848	43 5848	7 4152
2d Minimum.										
Lowest Extreme,	00 51	31 7547	19 2453	00 40	00 91	31 7547	19 2453	12 5094	63 5094	27 4906
Highest Do.	1 00	62 2642	37 7358	00 40	1 40	62 2642	37 7358	24 5284	124 5284	15 4716
Medium,	00 75	46 6981	28 3019	00 40	1 15	46 6981	28 3019	18 3962	93 3962	21 6038
3d Minimum.										
Lowest Extreme,	1 01	62 8868	38 1132	1 00	2 01	62 8868	38 1132	24 7736	125 7736	75 2264
Highest Do.	2 50	155 6604	94 3396	1 00	3 50	155 6604	94 3396	61 3308	311 3208	38 6792
Medium,	1 75½	109 2736	66 2264	1 00	2 75½	109 2736	66 2264	43 0472	218 5472	56 9528
4th Minimum.										
Lowest Extreme,	2 51	156 2830	94 7170	1 76	4 27	156 2830	94 7170	61 5660	312 5660	114 4340
Highest Do.	4 00	249 0566	150 9434	1 76	5 76	249 0566	150 9434	98 1132	498 1132	77 8868
Medium,	3 25½	202 6698	122 8302	1 76	5 01½	202 6698	122 8302	79 8396	405 3396	96 1604

Here then, Sir, is a calculation made at the utmost possible point at which importations can be made, and based upon the actual cost of the goods in a foreign market, as derived from facts well settled by the testimony of our manufacturers themselves. What, then, is the result? It is, Mr. Chairman, that at the highest extreme of each minimum, the protection is more than the difference in the cost of the wool in the two countries, and therefore more than is required.

If, then, the cost of the wool, and the cost of manufacturing it in this country, are equal; if the cost of manufacturing is as cheap here as it is in England; if the cost of wool in this country is greater than it is in England by 65 per cent., as an average, upon the English cost; and if I have shown that the bill, as reported by the Committee on Manufactures, covers this difference in the price of wool, and even goes beyond it, I have shown enough for my purpose.

The American manufacturer has by the bill, as reported, all the protection which he swears that he needs.

Here I should remark that these tables are cast upon the assumption that 65 per cent. is the true difference between the cost of wool in England and in the United States, although I have before noticed that there are strong reasons to believe that this per centage is greater than the difference which, in fact, exists, or that a less advance (say 50 per cent.) would pay the present duty, costs, and charges, and enable the importer to bring in foreign wool. My calculations have also been made upon the present prices of wool in this country, and the only possible manner of shaking them, or disproving their correctness, is by the assumption that the duty proposed by the bill, upon raw wool, is to enhance the price of that article to the extent of the duty. The soundness of this argument, as well as the propriety of its use, by the friends of the protecting system, I shall, by and by, have occasion to notice. But as a partial answer to it, supposing that the proposed duty upon wool may have some effect to enhance the price of it, I present the excess of duty over the protection required at the present prices of wool in this country. At all points of each minimum, that excess is considerable, but at the highest extreme of the first minimum, 50 cents, the only point in the whole bill where the present duty upon cloths is not increased, that excess amounts to more than 7 per cent. upon the value of the cloth, or 14 per cent. upon the value of the wool. At the highest extreme of the next minimum, \$1 00, the excess is 15 per cent. upon the cloth, or 30 per cent. upon the wool, and this again is the least excess to be found in the bill, with the exception of that at 50 cents. Will it then be contended, by the friends of protection, that wool is to rise in price, by the operation of protecting laws, beyond either of these rates of increase? If not, then the duties proposed by the bill will still be a sufficient protection to the manufacturer. It now then remains for me to answer a very few of the arguments used by the Hon. Chairman, (Mr. Mallary,) and as I suppose, intended to apply to the amendment he has offered, although he did not offer the amendment until after he closed his remarks.

The first position of his which I shall notice, is, that duties upon imports, imposed with a view to protection, do not operate as taxes upon

consumers. To this position I fully consent, and I had supposed that it was conceded by all the friends of the protecting system. The arguments of the Hon. Gentleman, to prove its correctness, are certainly sound if his data are correct. He instanced cotton cloth costing now in our markets 16 cents, and, also 9 cents per yard, and conclusively showed, as I understood him, although I was unable to follow accurately the calculation, that the present duty upon these cloths is nearly equal to their market value, and that, upon the principle that the duty is a tax, if that should be repealed, you would have the cloths for two or three cents a yard. He also noticed the article of cheese, and showed equally clearly, if I understood him, that, upon the same principle, if the duty upon cheese was repealed, you would not only have your pound of cheese for nothing, but would be entitled to a cent or two for taking it. He also showed us that upon nails nearly the same effect would follow, To these reasons, Sir, I can add nothing. They seem to me perfectly conclusive.

The Hon. Chairman also laid down another proposition to which I am compelled to give my assent. It was, that the whole market for raw wool in this country, must be to our own manufacturers. This, Sir, is undeniably true. It must be idle for our farmers to expect to export wool, when it is now 65 per cent. cheaper abroad than it is here. The only market our farmer can have for his wool must be at home. This market our manufacturers do and must control; and they will always regulate it by the price they can get for their cloths.

Another position of the Hon. Chairman was, that a supply of coarse wool is not produced in this country. To the correctness of this proposition I entirely dissent, and I have before given the reasons which induce me to do so, and which, I trust, have been a satisfactory answer to the assertion.

As to the frauds alleged to be committed in the importation of those coarse wools, the honorable chairman has given all the answer which he could have given; that, if these wools are imported in a foul state to disguise their quality, they will necessarily lose in cleansing, and that loss must operate to increase the duty upon the cleansed wool.—This is true, practically, to a certain extent, but not to the extent which the gentleman seems to suppose. But, Sir, suppose it to have been true up to this time, what effect has it upon the subject now before the committee? We are now to reason, not upon the existing law, but upon the effect of the law which we are about to pass. Let us then see what will be the inducements to these frauds, if the amendment proposed by the honorable chairman, (Mr. Mallary,) is adopted. One pound of wool, worth in a foreign market 16 cents, will, by that amendment, pay 20 cents duty. Mix with that pound of wool 1 pound of dirt, making two pounds in weight, and worth 8 cents per pound, and what duty will it then pay? The two pounds will still be worth only 16 cents, and will by that same amendment only be charged with a duty of 15 per cent. ad valorem; equal upon the 2 pounds of wool and dirt, to 2 64-100 cents. Here, then, you will have the same pound of wool imported, and consequently conflicting with a pound of

equal quality of our own wool, while, by this simple fraud, 17 36-100 cents are saved upon the duty it should pay—an amount greater than the cost of the pound of wool itself in the foreign market, and the same wool would pay a duty of 2 64-100, instead of 20 cents. Does, then, the bill as reported by the committee, furnish an effectual check to these frauds? That bill proposes a duty of 7 cents, specifically, upon every pound of wool imported, and a further duty upon all wool of 40 per cent ad valorem. The duty at that rate, upon one pound of wool worth 16 cents in the foreign market, would be about 14 cents; and any attempt to disguise its quality, by means which should add to its weight, would only increase the duty by 7 cents upon every pound weight added. This view of the case must certainly convince even the honorable chairman himself, that this provision of the bill is to be preferred, and that his amendment only proclaims a bounty upon frauds in the importation of coarse wools.

To another of the arguments used by the gentleman I cannot give my assent. To convince us that there is not at present a supply of wool in this country, he estimates, from what data I know not, that if this bill passes, an addition of $13\frac{1}{2}$ millions of pounds of wool will be required to supply the place of that which will be excluded. This must be assuming that not only foreign wool, but foreign cloth, will cease to be imported. Now, Sir, from 6 to $6\frac{1}{2}$ millions of dollars in value is the whole amount of importations of wool and woollens which you can exclude by any law. Of this value less than half will be wool. Will it then require $13\frac{1}{2}$ millions of pounds of wool, or the growth of 5 millions of sheep, to furnish this value? It cannot be so.

The honorable chairman also made several calculations to show the effect of this bill upon the manufacturers; but I could not follow him so as to obtain any thing more than his results, and I hope he will correct me if I do not state them correctly. I understood him to say, in relation to the first or 50 cent minimum proposed by the bill, that, without any reference to the proposed increase of duty upon wool, the manufacturer was made worse by 3 cents upon each square yard of cloth than he is by the present law. This is not so; for at the extreme point of that minimum of 50 cents value, the duty is only less by $2\frac{1}{3}$ cents upon the yard of cloth; while at 45 cents value it is precisely the same as the present duty, and at every value below that sum it is rapidly and materially increased; and while, too, the cloths now paying a duty of 25 per cent. fall within this minimum, and must pay from 80 to 48 per cent. But the honorable chairman says the bill, as reported by the committee, will increase the cost of the wool required to make each yard of cloth, $15\frac{1}{2}$ cents, and that this increase in the price of the wool is to be thrown entirely against the manufacturer, and, added to the reduction of the duty upon the cloth, is to make him $17\frac{1}{2}$ cents worse upon each yard of cloth than he now is.

Here I meet an argument, Mr. Chairman, which, coming from the source it does, greatly surprises me. Are we then, the friends of protection, to contend that a duty imposed upon an article, with a view to its protection, is to raise its price to the amount of the duty?

Are we now to admit that a duty upon imports, for protecting the industry of this country, is a tax upon the consumer to the amount of the duty? Is this sound in principle, that the whole duty imposed is to be added to the price of the article? Is a pound of wool now costing 17 cents in this country, by the operation of this duty upon wool to have added to it 7 cents, the specific duty proposed, and then 40 per cent. upon its value, making in all more than 14 cents, to arrive at its price in the market? If this be true as to wool, is it not equally true as to cloths? And are the values of cloths to advance in price equal to the amount of duty proposed to be levied upon them? Is the yard of cloth, costing now 50 cents, to cost 66 cents because 16 cents duty is imposed upon it? Is the yard of cloth, now worth 60 cents, to sell at \$1 in the market because 40 cents duty is imposed upon it? Is this to be the effect throughout this bill, and in regard to the duties proposed by the amendment if that is adopted? Sir, it is not, it will not be so; and if the honorable chairman had examined the effects of this argument, he would not have used it, nor would he have gone into calculations based upon it. The principle of it is not sound, and so I supposed him and myself had agreed in a former position of his, which I have already noticed.

But, Sir, I have made some very short calculations upon the chairman's own principle, to compare the effect of the amendment with the bill reported by the Committee, even upon the supposition that that principle is well founded. But before I examine them I will repeat what I understood to be one of the principles of calculation, used by the honorable Chairman. I did understand him, in the estimates he gave, not only to assume that the price of wool would be raised to the full amount of the duty, but also to assume that the ad valorem duty imposed by the bill was 50 per cent., and to make his calculations accordingly. I was then correct in my understanding. I had hoped that I was mistaken, as the bill does not in fact propose an ad valorem duty upon wool of but 40 per cent. with a recommendation for a progressive advance of duty of 5 per cent. annually, until it shall reach 50 per cent., which will not be until two years from the 30th of June next; and as this progressive advance of duty is precisely such as had been urged by the honorable Chairman, and such as he has provided for in his proposed amendment, I had hoped, if the bill reported by the Committee was to be represented by figures, to go out to the public, it would be represented as it is, and not to be what time may make it hereafter.

The first calculation of the honorable Chairman was in relation to the first or 50 cent minimum. I will present, upon that minimum, for the purpose of a comparison between the bill and the proposed amendment, the following calculation.

I will take the highest extreme of the minimum as the point upon which the Chairman calculated. A square yard of cloth will cost 50 cents, and the wool, being half, will cost 25 cents. A reference to the testimony will show that 1½ lbs. of wool will be required to make a yard of the cloth. This will bring the wool at 20 cents per pound, and therefore it cannot come in under the denomination of 8 cent wool, by

the provision contained in the amendment. The comparison will then stand as follows, upon the supposition that the cost of the wool is to be increased by the amount of the duty:

Committee's Bill.

Specific duty on $1\frac{1}{2}$ pounds wool, cost 20 cents,	-	\$ 00 08 $\frac{1}{2}$
40 per cent. on 25 cents, value of wool,	- - -	00 10
		<hr/>
Whole duty proposed by bill,	- - - - -	00 18 $\frac{1}{2}$
Deduct present duty on wool, 30 per cent. on 25 cents,		
value of wool,	- - - - -	00 07 $\frac{1}{2}$
		<hr/>
Excess of duty over present,	- - - - -	11 $\frac{1}{2}$
Add reduction of duty on cloth,	- - - - -	2 $\frac{1}{2}$
		<hr/>
Manufacturer worse on yard of cloth,	- - - - -	13 $\frac{8}{10}$

Mallary's Amendment.

Specific duty on $1\frac{1}{2}$ pounds wool, cost 20 cents,	-	\$ 00 25
No ad valorem duty.		
Deduct present duty on wool, 30 per cent. on 25 cents,		00 07 $\frac{1}{2}$
		<hr/>
Excess of duty over present,	- - - - -	00 17 $\frac{1}{2}$
Proposed duty on cloth, 22 cents,		
Deduct present duty, 18 $\frac{1}{2}$		
		<hr/>
		3 $\frac{2}{3}$
		<hr/>
Manufacturer worse on yard of cloth,	- - - - -	13 $\frac{5}{6}$

At this rate of calculation, therefore, the manufacturer is better by the amendment than he is by the bill only as $\frac{4}{5}$ of a cent is more than $\frac{5}{6}$ of a cent. I understood the Chairman to take, in making this calculation, $1\frac{1}{2}$ pounds of wool for a yard of cloth. Should he be correct in this, although it would not alter the relative proportions of the bill and amendment, yet it would, in this mode of estimation, show the amendment to be considerably the worse for the manufacturer.

The next calculation was upon carpets. Here I should say, Sir, that I, as one member of the Committee on Manufactures, was mistaken, and I believe the majority of the Committee were. I did suppose, and I think they did, that the carpeting now paying a duty of 25 cents the square yard, would fall within the \$1 00 minimum, and therefore would, by the bill, pay a duty of 40 cents the square yard; and I am not now satisfied that it will not. But it is said by some, that this is not the case; and so far as I am acquainted, it has been distinctly understood by every member of that Committee, except one, who is opposed entirely to the system, that the bill should be amended so as to render this duty certain upon these goods. This was stated by the honorable Chairman, but not until after he had given us calcu-

lations as to the effect of the bill in its present shape. I have therefore only to say, Sir, in relation to my mistake, that I took the Harrisburg propositions for the directory in making my propositions upon woollens; and, as carpetings were not mentioned in their proposed alterations of duty, I overlooked them under the impression I have just stated. I will further refer the honorable Chairman to his own proposed amendment upon this subject. That proposes a duty of twenty-two cents the square yard upon all goods falling within the 50 cent minimum. If these carpetings fall within it, he will then only impose a duty of 22 cents, instead of the 25 cents imposed by the present law. The bill, therefore, will reduce this duty 9 cents, and the Chairman's amendment 3 cents on each yard. But should this duty be reduced? Does he wish and intend to reduce it? I understand him to assert that he does. I, Sir, had no such intention. I had supposed that the manufacturers of this article also wanted further protection. This, however, will account for my mistake, if it is one.

The Chairman further made estimates upon cloth at one dollar, and at 75 cents the square yard. I will institute the same comparisons between the bill and amendment upon these estimates.

In cloth at \$1 per square yard the wool will be half, 50 cents, and at 1½ lbs. to the yard, the wool will cost 33½ cents per pound.

Committee's Bill.

Specific duty on 1½ pounds at 33½ cents	-	-	-	\$00 10½
40 per cent. on 50 cents, value of wool	-	-	-	00 20

Whole duty proposed by bill	-	-	\$00 30½
Deduct present duty, 30 per cent. upon 50 cents, value of wool	-	-	00 15

Excess of duty over present	-	-	00 15½
Proposed duty on cloth, 40 cents			
Deduct present duty	33½		
	6½	-	00 6½

Manufacturer worse on a yard of cloth	00 8½
---------------------------------------	-------

Mallary's Amendment.

Specific duty on 1½ pounds of wool, (being all the duty proposed by the amendment) at 33½ cents	-	-	\$00 30
Deduct present duty, 30 per cent. on 50 cents, value of wool	-	-	00 15

Excess of duty over present	-	-	00 15
Proposed duty on cloth \$1 00			
Present duty, deduct	33½		
	66½	-	00 66½
Manufacturer better on yard of cloth	-		00 51½

Cloth at 75 cents per square yard, the wool will be half, $37\frac{1}{2}$ cents, and at $1\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. to the yard, will cost 25 cents per pound.

Committee's Bill.

Specific duty on $1\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. wool, at 25 cents	-	-	-	\$00 10 $\frac{1}{2}$
40 per cent. on $37\frac{1}{2}$ cents, value of wool				00 15
Whole duty proposed by bill				00 25 $\frac{1}{2}$
Deduct present duty, 30 per cent.	-	-	-	00 11 $\frac{1}{4}$
Excess of duty over present				00 14 $\frac{1}{4}$
Proposed duty on cloth 40				
Present duty, deduct 25	-	-	-	00 15
Manufacturer better on yard of cloth				00 00 $\frac{3}{4}$

Mallary's Amendment.

Specific duty on 1½ lbs. wool, at 25 cents per lb.	-	-	\$00 30
Deduct present duty, 30 per cent.	-	-	00 11¼
			<hr/>
Excess above present duty	-	-	00 18¾
Proposed duty on cloth	\$1 00		
Deduct present duty,	0 25	-	00 75
			<hr/>
Manufacturer better on yard of cloth			- 00 56¼

Thus much, Sir, for calculations made upon the principle that duties upon imports are taxes upon consumers to the amount of the duty; and now I leave the choice of the bill or the amendment to the committee, if the choice is to be made upon this principle. In the first minimum they do not materially differ. At the highest extreme of the second, if the bill be adopted, the balance will stand between 8 and 9 cents, upon a yard of cloth, against the manufacturer; while, if the amendment is adopted, the balance will stand more than 50 cents in his favor upon a yard of cloth, now costing one dollar. At the medium of this same minimum, the amount will be all but exactly balanced by the bill. By the amendment, the manufacturer will have the advantage to the amount of about 56 cents, upon a yard of cloth now worth 75 cents. This is upon the principle that the price of the cloth will rise to the amount of the duty, as well as the wool; and surely it will not be contended that the rule is applicable to the one, and not to the other.

But, Sir, it is not applicable to either. Such was not the doctrine of the Convention, which adopted the provisions contained in this amendment; and to show what rates of increase of the present duty that Convention intended practically to impose, I will read from their report, as I will also to show what were their opinions as to this allegation, that the imposition of a duty is to enhance the price of the article upon which it is imposed. The Convention say, in reference to the propositions they had agreed upon: "Goods costing 50 cents per square

yard, will pay 20 cents per square yard, instead of $16\frac{2}{3}$ cents, the present rate of duty;

“Those costing two dollars and fifty cents will pay 100 cents, instead of $83\frac{1}{3}$;

“Those costing four dollars, will pay 160 cents, instead of $133\frac{1}{3}$;

“Those costing six dollars, will pay 240 cents, instead of 200.

“The advance of duties asked for is not large; but the request being granted, the duties *intended to be paid will be paid*, or nearly so, except when smuggled; the difference between the minimums, as regulated by the square yard, being so considerable that fraudulent invoices will seldom be offered, and more rarely pass through the Custom Houses—if the appraisers, with moderate industry, perform their office.

“In objection to this scheme of proposed duties, it will be said, (as it was said about cottons, and last year about woollens,) that the duties payable will be enormous, &c. Thus it will be *calculated*—that cloth costing fifty-one cents per square yard, will be rated as though it cost 250 cents per square yard, and be subject to a duty of 100 cents per square yard, two hundred per cent., or twice the amount of the original cost of the article, one cent excepted, and we shall have many great speeches about that.

“And this is very true. We pretend not to deny or disguise it. Yet with such a law, who would be fool enough to import cloth costing 51 cents per square yard, and pay 100 cents duty per square yard upon it, when he might import cloth at 50 cents, or a little less, and pay only 20 cents duty? It is absurd to suppose that any such cloth will ever be imported. The foreign manufacturers and importers would adapt all the cloths designed for our markets *exactly to the minimums established, or a little below them*, and then would pay only $6\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. more duty than was intended that they should pay by the tariff of 1824; and this advance, to favor the manufacturers, will not repay them, for the present, the reduction of their profits, because of the proposed advance of duty upon imported wool—admitting that all which is asked for wool and woollens shall be granted by Congress. *This is practical truth.*”

And again, in reference to their views of the operation of the system they had proposed, and of the effect of imposing duties upon the price of the article protected, they say—

“To be sure, this plan would secure to our own manufacturers the home market for those kinds of cloths for which American wool is particularly fitted; and this is every way desirable, to cause a brisk demand for such wool and encourage the manufacture of it. And the minimums will powerfully check all attempts at “monopoly” and “extortion,” should the domestic *competition* fail to prevent them. But these cannot be really feared by any who dispassionately consider the subject, and reflect that every article, the manufacture of which is protected, is cheaper than the like foreign article at its place of exportation. Witness cotton goods, and the triumphant state of our protected navigation.”

Thus, Sir, it would seem that this Convention did not intend to impose a greater operative duty than about $6\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. in addition to that already imposed by law. Does then the bill, as reported by the Committee, fail in any instance to give that increase of the present duty? It does not, even at the highest extremes of the respective minimums, except in the 50 cents minimum. I am aware that the Committee have interposed an additional minimum at \$1 00. But, Sir, I had supposed that the object of establishing this minimum principle was, not so much to produce a practical increase of the duty, as to prevent frauds in the faithful and just collection of the duties intended to be imposed. I well know that the necessary effect of adapting this form of a law would be a considerable increase of the nominal rate of duty, and I also had supposed that another necessary effect of it would be to cause a total exclusion at certain points of each minimum, and thus, as the Convention say, "secure to our own manufactures the home market," for such cloth as should be excluded. But I did also suppose, that if each minimum was so far removed from the other as to produce no confusion in determining the description of cloth falling within each, this was all that was required. If I have been correct in this opinion, there certainly can be no difficulty between the two lowest minimums in the bill. In so low priced woollen cloths as those costing fifty cents, and those costing one dollar per square yard only, a small difference in value must create a very palpable distinction in the quality. I have not, however, heard any difficulty upon this point urged as an objection to the bill. On the contrary, Sir, I urge this easy distinction in the qualities of coarse cloths as one merit of the bill. It will ensure a rigid collection of the duty; and will, therefore, in these low minimums, exclude all cloths falling below the highest extreme of each. But, Sir, take no minimum between fifty cents and \$2 50, and what will be the effect? You will necessarily exclude all cloths between 50 cents and \$2 the square yard, at the least, and probably the exclusion will go to a greater value. What description of cloths will you then embrace? The 50 cents minimum reaches, and acts upon, flannels, baizes, and other thin cloths, upon which, I believe, it is admitted that sufficient protection is furnished by the bill. It also reaches another description of cloths: I mean negro cloths; upon which I have before remarked, that the duty would be much greater than by any former law: and still the Committee have fixed the specific duty upon that minimum as low as they supposed would be sure to furnish the required protection.

Another part of the policy of the Committee, adopted from the same sense of justice, was to impose a very light additional duty upon the cloths worn by the common laboring classes at the North. These cloths are mostly embraced within the minimum, inserted in the bill, between 50 cents and \$1. Adopt then the amendment, totally exclude those cloths, as I have shown this will do, and I ask where is the minimum, in the language of the Harrisburg Convention, which "will powerfully check all attempts at monopoly and extortion," in its application to this description of cloth? What guard will this class of our citizens have against the monopoly of our own manufacturers? They will have none, Sir; and

the cloths worn by them are those which you ought to touch lightly, if at all. After you get beyond \$2 50, as the price of a square yard of cloth, it matters little what duty you impose. The cloth then becomes emphatically a luxury, and the duty falls upon those able to bear it, if it shall operate, as is here contended, to raise the price; and if the funds of the purchaser are not equal to the advanced price, he has only to drop down to the lower minimum, and purchase his cloth of a little coarser quality. But, Sir, this cannot be said of the cloths falling within the 50 cent minimum. Here there is no falling price. This embraces all, and is the lowest point. Nor can it be said with more propriety of the cloths falling between the 50 cent and \$1 minimum. No cloths below 50 cents can answer their use. The negro cloths cannot and will not be worn by the Northern laborers. Neither their climate nor their feelings will permit it. What then is the character of the bill? Its policy is to reduce the duty to the lowest practicable point upon the coarse and common cloths, and to increase it ratably upon the fine. Hence the duty is depressed as low as possible upon the 50 cent minimum, and not quite so rigidly depressed upon that between 50 cents and \$1, while upon the finer qualities it is much increased beyond either. And, Sir, while I declare this to have been the policy by which I was actuated in agreeing to this bill, I hope I shall not be represented as affecting a friendship for the poor, which I do not feel. I do believe that every possibility of monopoly upon the cloths they are compelled to purchase, should be guarded against; and, Mr. Chairman, if I ask protection for the poor against the rich, for those who have not capital against those that have, I only ask it for myself: and therefore my request should not be considered as affected. But this bill does furnish, in its present shape, all the protection which the manufacturer needs, upon every description of cloth embraced in it, the raw material remaining as at present.

As to the duty proposed upon wool operating to increase that price, what does the bill do? It does all that can be done. It puts the wool market into the hands of the manufacturer, and he must and will control it. Will he then raise the price of wool, unless the price of cloths is raised also? Will he give more for wool than the price of his cloths will warrant? I know, Sir, I shall be asked, why then propose to increase the duty on wool? I do not expect to raise the price of the article by doing so, unless the effect of the bill should be to raise the price of cloths, so as to warrant it. But, I do expect it will extend the demand for domestic wool; that it will give this the place of the foreign wool. The farmer must go to the manufacturer for a market for his wool. I would make this obligation reciprocal. I would compel the manufacturer to go to the farmer for his supply of wool. Then the regulation of the price would be reciprocal between them. But now the manufacturer has a double advantage. He can choose between the foreign and the domestic wool, while much of the foreign is introduced nearly free of duty. In relation, further, to this argument, that the increase of duty upon wool will increase the price—has that been the effect of the increase of duty imposed by the tariff of 1824? Has

not the price of wool been constantly and rapidly diminishing since the passage of that law? It has, Sir; nor was this *reduction* of price occasioned by the imposition of the duty; but it has been checked by it. Repeal the duty, and would wool rise in price? No, Sir, not while wool abroad remains so low, nor while cloths remain at their present prices. Give the manufacturer the protection he needs, as against the foreigner, and then he will regulate the wool market as his business will warrant. Whence, then, is this alarm on the subject of an increased duty on wool? I do not see the cause of it. The experience of the past does not warrant it, and I do not believe the evils predicted will be at all realized.

The objection, however, to the amendment, is double. It will not provide for the consumption of our coarse wools, and it will permit the importation of the fine foreign wools assorted, at a great reduction of the present duty, and which will come in direct competition with our own fine assorted wools.

But, Mr. Chairman, upon what principles are we to settle the provisions of this bill? Have I mistaken them? I have examined the report from the Secretary of the Treasury—a detailed, and in some respects, an able document, and I find in that report doctrines upon this subject, to which, if I understand them, I cannot subscribe.

I will trouble the Committee with reading a short extract from this executive paper; and I shall have finished my task, as painful to myself as it has been tedious to the House.

The honorable Secretary says—"Moreover, the further encouragement of manufactures by legislative means, would be but a counterbalance, and at most a partial one, to the encouragement to agriculture by legislative means, standing out in the very terms upon which the public lands are sold. It is not here intended to make the system of selling off the territorial domain of the Union, a subject of any commentary, and still less of any complaint. The system is interwoven beneficially with the highest interests and destiny of the nation. It rests upon foundations, both of principles and practice, deep and immoveable; foundations not to be uprooted or shaken. But our gravest attention may, on this account, be but the more wisely summoned to the consideration of correlative duties, which the existence of such a system in the heart of the State imposes. It cannot be overlooked, that the prices at which fertile bodies of land may be bought of the government under this system, operate as a perpetual allurements to their purchase. It must, therefore, be taken in the light of a bounty, indelibly written in the text of the laws themselves, in favor of agricultural pursuits. Such it is, in effect, though not in form.

"Perhaps no enactment of legislative bounties has ever before operated upon a scale so vast, throughout a series of years, and over the face of an entire nation, to turn population and labor into one particular channel, preferably to all others. The utmost extent of protection granted to manufactures or commerce, by our statutes, collectively, since the first foundation of the government, has been, in its mere

effect of drawing the people of the United States into those pursuits, as nothing to it. No scale of imports, no prohibitions or penalties, no bounties, no premiums, enforced or dispensed at the custom-house, has equalled it. It has served, and still serves to draw, in an annual stream, the inhabitants of a majority of the States, including amongst them at this day, a portion, not small, of the western States, into the settlement of fresh lands, lying still farther and farther off."

If I correctly understand the sentiment here expressed, it is, that by legislation of another character, and relating to a different subject, this Government, for many years, has been, and now is, constantly holding out a heavy bounty to the agriculture of the country; and I should clearly infer, from the language here used, that it is not the recommendation of the Secretary that the interests of agriculture should be at all embraced in the bill we are now to pass, but that we should frame this law with the intent to counterbalance, to the manufacturing interest, the bounties already bestowed upon the agricultural. This, Sir, is not the policy of the bill reported by the Committee, nor is it a policy, the correctness of which I can assent to.

Where, let me ask, is the agricultural interest, in this country, which receives this large bounty from our present land system? Are the old settled parts of the country benefited? The only effect of these cheap sales of the public land upon them is to reduce and depress the price of their lands, and to render them extremely dull in the market. Unless this is a bounty, they receive none. If any section, then, is greatly benefited, it must be that where these lands are, and the bounty, if any, must be to the settlers upon the lands. To them the low price of these lands may be, in a certain sense, a donation.

It is true, if a man, wishing to purchase his 100 acres of land, has but \$125, it will be better for him to obtain the land for that sum, than to be compelled to pay a higher price, by which he may be driven to pay out his money, and contract a heavy and ruinous debt for the balance. But, Sir, I deny the doctrine, even as applicable to these settlers, in the sense which this language conveys; and more strongly do I deny the fact, that the manner of selling the public lands operates as a bounty to the agricultural interests of the country generally, or that it gives to that interest an advantage over any other. I cannot consent to the idea that the agriculture of the country has, in this way, incurred a debt to the manufacturing interest, to be paid off by our legislation upon this bill. I cannot even be satisfied that this doctrine was intended to be advanced by the report, or that this meaning was intended to be conveyed by the extract I have given: and still I am unable to give it any other construction. No, Sir, I represent a section of country newly settled and now settling; and I know, of my own knowledge, that, if you have a needy and destitute population in your country, it is those who settle your new lands. If there be a class of your citizens who suffer more hardships and greater privations than any other, it is not your manufacturers, but those who give value to the wilderness by reducing it to fertile fields. These are the citi-

zens who most need and require the protection of the government. I cannot, therefore, subscribe to the opinion, that your system of selling the public lands, however low in price, has brought even these citizens, and much less the agriculturists of the country generally, in debt to the manufacturing, or to any other interest,—or that they are, for such cause, to be deprived of protection by this bill.